DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 766 IR 006 370

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Collection Analysis in Research Libraries. Minutes of the Meeting (91st, Annapolis, Maryland, October 26-27, 1977). |
| INSTITUTION | Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | Oct 77 |
| NOTE | 117p.; For related document, see IR 006 369 |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00 per issue) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Annual Reports; Committees; *Conference Reports; Library Acquisition; *Library Associations; *Library Collections; Library Planning; *Research Libraries; Speeches; University Libraries |
| IDENTIFIERS | Academic Libraries; *Collection Analysis Project |

ABSTRACT

The minutes of the October 26-27, 1977 meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) include the texts of the following presentations on collection development and analysis in research libraries: "A Faculty View of Library Collection Development," Harry J. Dell; "Issues Encountered in the Collection Analysis Project," Jeffrey J. Gardner; "A Concept of Collection Analysis and Development," Duane E. Webster; "Collection Analysis in a Decentralized System," Jay Lucker; "Planning Growth in an Emerging Research Library," Donald Koepp; "Analyzing A Large, Complex Research Collection," Sheila Dowd; and "Twenty Years of the Council on Library Resources" (Keynote Address), William Dix. The majority of the presentations emphasize the Collection Analysis Project (CAP) undertaken by the Office of Management Studies. Minutes from the business meeting, committee and special reports, and lists of ARL officers, board of directors, committees, and membership conclude the report. (JPF)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

- ED158766

US ISSN 0044-9652

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# Collection Analysis In Research Libraries

## *Minutes of the Ninety-first Meeting*

October 26-27, 1977
Annapolis, Maryland

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne Frankie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

I2006370

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Opening | 1 |
| A FACULTY VIEW OF LIBRARY COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT<br>Harry J. Dell | 2 |
| ISSUES ENCOUNTERED IN THE COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT<br>Jeffrey J. Gardner | 7 |
| A CONCEPT OF COLLECTION ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT<br>Duane E. Webster | 11 |
| COLLECTION ANALYSIS IN A DECENTRALIZED SYSTEM<br>Jay Lucker | 16 |
| PLANNING GROWTH IN AN EMERGING RESEARCH LIBRARY<br>Donald Koepp | 21 |
| ANALYZING A LARGE, COMPLEX RESEARCH COLLECTION<br>Sheila Dowd | 24 |
| GROUP DISCUSSION | 28 |
| TWENTY YEARS OF THE COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES (Keynote Address)<br>William Dix | 34 |
| BUSINESS MEETING | 40 |
| Election of Board Members | 40 |
| Publication of Thirteen Colonial Americana | 41 |
| Special Report: The Library of Congress | 42 |
| Report of the Executive Director | 46 |
| Report of the Task Force on ARL Statistics | 57 |
| Report of the Committee on Access to Rare Books and Manuscripts | 53 |
| Special Announcement | 60 |
| Report of the Office of University Library Management Studies | 61 |
| Report of the President | 63 |

Page

APPENDICES


A. Office of University Library Management Studies
Seventh Annual Report ..... 67
B. Report of the Interlibrary Loan Committee ..... 87
C. Annual Report of the ARL Committee on Access to
Manuscripts and Rare Books ..... 88
D. Report of the Preservation of Library Materials Committee ..... 91
E. Annual Report of the Foreign Acquisitions Committee
on East Asia ..... 92
F. Annual Report of the Foreign Acquisitions Committee
on Latin America ..... 95
G. Attendance at 91st Membership Meeting
Institutional List ..... 97
Guests ..... 100
Name Index for Members ..... 101
H. Officers, Board of Directors, Committees
and Task Forces of the Association ..... 104
I. Membership of the Association of Research Libraries ..... 109

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 91st Meeting

Edward C. Lathem, presiding

The Ninety-first Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Annapolis Hilton Hotel, Annapolis, Maryland, on October 26, 1977.

President Edward Lathem opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

President Lathem then turned the program over to Ray Frantz, Jr., who introduced the morning's speakers.

# A FACULTY VIEW OF LIBRARY COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

Harry J. Dell
University of Virginia

## Introduction

RAY FRANTZ: There are probably no more urgent issues before us today than those connected with collection development, namely, rising prices and falling budgets. We all know the fix we are in. We no longer have, in Mark Twain's words, the confidence of a Christian with four aces.

The ARL Board has responded to the membership's concern by supporting efforts by the Office of Management Studies to secure funding, study the problem, create a model, and make proposals. The result is the Collection Analysis Project. This morning's session is devoted to the collection development issue, within the context of this project. After our opening speaker, Jeff Gardner will speak on "The Issues Encountered in the Collection Analysis Project"; then Duane Webster will speak on "A Concept of Collection Analysis".

Our opening speaker has been, for me, a most knowledgeable and invaluable friend at the University of Virginia. As an historian, he uses books, writes books, and knows how research libraries work. He has been a key member of the University Library Committee, and a valuable one. His commitment extends to our own Association, for which he serves as a member of the ARL Advisory Group on the Collection Analysis Project. He will speak to us this morning on the subject, "A Faculty View of Library Collection Development".

* * * *

HARRY J. DELL: I want to thank you all for allowing an active faculty member to come before a group such as this, because scholars know very little about the ways libraries actually work. They think they do, as I am sure you all are aware. They know still less about library organizations and how libraries -- especially research libraries -- are interrelated. I would venture a guess that very few faculty people have ever heard of ARL, let alone know about the Collection Analysis Project. Perhaps it is just as well. As such, I am interested to find out what is going on in what is really nothing more than a separate side of academic work.

I suppose that, in the pipe dreams of a traditional scholar, the library is a place where he goes to do research and to conduct some high-level teaching. In this pipe dream, the library should be like a 19th Century British gentleman's club for doing research, filled with overstuffed chairs where he can sit down while some magical aid brings him the book that he wants, perhaps a whiskey and soda on occasion or something like that. For his teaching, why, of course, he would want a well stocked seminar room, so that, when he wants to wax eloquent about one minute point to be found in Footnote 3B on page 451, he can simply point to the books round about him with a spread of his hand.

Well, of course, that traditional pipe dream never really existed, and, for most of us who manage to write and do our work in carrels and enclosures without windows, heat, or what-not, I am afraid this probably will always remain a bit of a pipe dream.

If this is what a faculty member would like to dream about a library, what kind of a real view do the faculty have about libraries and librarians, especially with regard to collection? First off, I should say that there is no such thing as a faculty view. Faculties, like everything else, are a mixture of interrelating personalities. Some personalities are responsible, some are absolutely crazy, some are ingenious, but they are all quite demanding, especially with regard to their own particular work. Being realistic, therefore, I am just trying to give you an overview of what one faculty member seems to think is going on. Much of what I am going to say will probably be well known to you, because you have encountered the same problems, or at least heard about them before. There are a few places in this country which have not been hit by the recent academic recession (if I can call it that), places which are still expanding, hiring, and expanding their budgets. But it is to the rest of us, that is, about ninety-nine percent of us, that I intend to speak.

One of the curious things happening to the academic side of life in this age of contraction which has been upon us since 1970 is an attempt to reduce every member of the academic staff to some sort of accountability. I think this all started ten to 15 years ago in government when they introduced what they call "cost analysis" for defense systems, and it has gradually worked its way on down from various state agencies to our level. In private universities I am sure this has not been quite as prevalent as it has in those which are publicly funded. Yet, even in states which are not known for their rapid adjustment to the way the rest of the world is going -- my own state of Virginia has such a reputation -- there have been attempts to take account of the actual teaching and research load of every single individual. This has not been used to a great extent yet, but no one knows what the future holds, and the fact that more and more states are going in for this has caused some difficulty among faculty who are trying to adjust to what is going on.

The primary interest among the younger faculty in any university or college system is in getting tenure, which is supposed to end all their worries. It never does, but they think it will, and they are primarily interested in teaching their classes and doing research. Among older faculty, however, this new system of separating those people who are pulling their own weight from those who are not is causing all kinds of faculty to look around at their actual teaching loads. It used to be that if a department pulled its own weight in terms of its teaching load, or if various colleges within a university did, that was sufficient. Now, with these various machine systems, a politician sitting in a state capitol can readily determine who is pulling his weight and who is not on an individual basis.

What is this doing? Clearly, in an age when jobs are rather few and far between, this is causing people to try to convince undergraduates to come into their classes. What we are seeing, even among older faculty, is an attempt to

run up their enrollments by introducing more undergraduate classes or different kinds of undergraduate classes. The reason I bring this up is that, in the long run, this is bound to have an effect on the demands that will be felt by libraries. As far as libraries are concerned, undergraduates were mostly a problem of space in the last decade: Where do you put all these people who want to come, take their books, and sit down and study? Now, however, there is a demand for more and more intricate courses for undergraduates, both at the beginning level and at upper levels. In fact, as the graduate population in many places tends to diminish, the faculty who previously had spent most of their time teaching graduate seminars now find they are teaching surveys. They find that they are introducing courses for undergraduates. What this is going to mean is a different kind of demand for monograph and periodical publications. The new demand will not necessarily be for the extremely specialized stuff, but for works of a more general nature.

The greatest change that has come about in the method of doing research and in training students since I began graduate work in the 1950's was the general acceptance of the Library of Congress classification system. This, of course, was necessary because of what was happening. But when you used to train graduate students by the method of shelf reading, especially in those institutions which had older methods of classification, one could define a particular topic and send students out and say, "In a particular area, you will find all the library has on a particular subject." Well, of course that cannot be done today. One of the basic problems with graduate students now is teaching them how to use a reference room, and, from the reference room, the card catalogues and so on. I am not sure we are entirely over that change yet. But with younger people coming into the field, I think this is a problem which will solve itself.

To move on to the collection problem, the major difficulty today is how we can finance the continued expansion of our collections in the face of our contracting university. It would come as no surprise to you that, in an age of contraction, the first thing deans, provosts, and department chairmen try to hold onto is their personnel. Although there ought to be a natural alliance between library people and faculty, because, of course, they are all after the same thing -- furtherance of research and so forth -- when a department chairman is faced with the fact that there is only so much money, and he must choose between holding onto his personnel or cutting the library's book budget, I think nine times out of ten he will allow the library's book budget to be cut. I regard this as pernicious, myself, but it exemplifies the fact that we clearly need more interrelations between faculty and libraries.

I am just about old enough to remember some of the problems of the Great Depression of the 1930's. When I began doing research in graduate school, I began to find out that other things happened in the 1930's besides the fact that people were out of work, that they had little food, and so forth. One of the great problems in libraries is still with us: the enormous gaps in library collections caused by that time when there simply was not enough money. Right now, we are not in a period of recession as severe as the 1930's, when such things had to be done simply in order to exist. But I am concerned that, if the book acquisition budgets in libraries are continually punished in order

to preserve personnel in various departments and colleges, in the long run we will be cheating the children of the next generation. Considering that we have a relatively stable college population now -- and one which seems bound to diminish for at least the next 15 years or so -- we must stop the raiding of library budgets to hold onto personnel who, in the long run, are probably not going to be needed. It may seem cruel and nasty to say that some people are going to have to go. But, even though it is unfortunate, I am afraid that is the case. I also worry that it is far easier just to chop X number of dollars from the library budget than it is to take a closer accounting of personnel needs. Library directors themselves, having spent years building up their own personnel group in order to gear up for larger acquisitions, are themselves reluctant to cut back. But some of these things are going to have to happen.

What can one do about them? I think that, up to now, there has not been a great deal of interaction between library and faculty of this problem. I do not believe that libraries have made enough attempt to say, "We realize that personnel decisions are very difficult, but, on the other hand, are we going to cheat future generations by cutting our book budgets to a level which is simply unacceptable?" How this must be handled is, of course, something that has to be looked at differently in each place. Attempts at cost reductions are now being made. There are various microfiche and microfilm plans, and the extent to which this will be accepted may vary according to the age of the faculty and the conditions of an individual university. At a rising institution, a newer one which clearly had inferior library resources in the recent past and is now acquiring at a greater rate, the faculty may be told that by subscribing to a new system, great amounts of new periodicals and/or monograph material will be available to them, and I think the faculty is simply going to say, "Why, that's wonderful, because we have not had access to this before." In an older, more developed institution where the faculty is simply told, "We are going over to a new system which will require you to read things on a microfilm or microfiche reproduction instead of having the periodicals or monographs directly in your hands," there are going to be objections. I think it is one of the duties of the Collection Analysis Project to make obvious why this is necessary.

The extent to which this will be accepted also differs by area. People in the arts, who normally have long monographs to read, will not be as happy to find that a monograph is only available on microfilm as someone in the sciences, where their literature is generally confined to articles. There is always the problem, as the psychologists tell us, that if you have to read white print against a black background, there is a great deal more eyestrain than if the print is black against a white background. I do not know why this is true, but one hears this complaint continually.

What can we say? I do not believe faculty really understand what has been happening to libraries. Since they buy books, they do understand that the price has gone up, not only for American books, but especially for European books. However, I do not believe they quite understand the enormity of the rise in costs in periodicals, which has put some library budgets almost out of the monograph business entirely. It is just absolutely outrageous.

Well, the only defense against this, I suppose, is what one might define as orderly procedures, such as the CAP project. To reduce yoursleves to an orderly method is, in a sense, a defense mechanism, but it is a dynamic one. It is a method by which one can say, "We are doing what we should because we have to." We are doing it for future generations, and these are procedures which can be expanded in the future, should economic conditions change. Once these projects are completed, the faculty needs to be sold on these procedures, or at least have these explained. Again, this is a contact problem. I think that, in the long run, faculties will respond to these various procedures, once they understand them.

One of the big changes that has happened in the last ten years, especially with developing libraries, has been the development of competent ordering staffs, especially in places where, only a few years ago, a faculty member simply wrote out an order card himself if he wanted a book. Now, more and more libraries do this themselves. The fact that procedures are being written out and more clearly defined gives us one answer to the question of how you compete for funds with the provost, with the deans, or whoever the financial agents are. One can simply say that he is acting in accordance with nationally accepted standards for research libraries and according to such and such procedures. I think that is a better defense than simply saying, "Well, we need the money because we need the money." In the long run I think it will work out.

# ISSUES ENCOUNTERED IN THE COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT

Jeffrey J. Gardner

Harry Dell has provided us a scholar's view of the importance of research library collections and the concerns of university faculty regarding the continued development of these collections. I would like to look at some of these same issues from the perspective of research librarians.

During the last year or so, the OMS completed a SPEC survey on collection development and carried out a dozen site visits to ARL libraries in connection with the Collection Analysis Project. These surveys highlighted for us some of the collection development concerns of research libraries, some of the roots of these concerns, and some of the responses that may be needed to deal with them effectively in the future.

For most research libraries, the chief problem is economics: Simply stated, rising materials costs have substantially outstripped increases in library materials budgets. Since 1970, many ARL libraries have experienced 25 to 50 percent reductions in their acquisition rates, but it is apparent that these libraries face many other pressures, including, ironically, the consequences of the rapid growth of collections in the nineteen-fifties and sixties.

During this period it became necessary to develop large research collections to support the growing research programs at American universities, and, generally, universities had the resources necessary to support these collections. While the importance of these collections cannot be over-emphasized, they have left an expensive legacy. The accumulated investment in collections and bibliographic records greatly influences the options available for future collection development. We are all familiar with the difficulty of reducing commitments to historically strong collections, and, in that sense, current collection allocation decisions are frequently the product, if not the prisoner, of the past.

This situation is particularly acute in connection with serials and journals. Continuing commitments for serial publications account for an ever-increasing proportion of libraries' materials budgets--up to 70 or 80 percent in some libraries--and there is concern that this is leading to an accidental biasing of collections toward the sciences. Many libraries automatically protect their serials budgets each year, adding the appropriate inflation factor and allocating whatever remains to the monographs budget for university programs. This approach results partly from the importance of serials and partly from the difficulty and expense of filling gaps in later. A number of ARL libraries have nonetheless been forced to place a freeze on new serial titles and to eliminate virtually all duplicate subscriptions. These have been stop-gap measures, but there are indications that stronger actions may be necessary in the future.

Another consequence of the growth of research library collections has been the definition of a unique role for research libraries. They are supported primarily to serve local program needs, but they are--individually and in the aggregate--a national resource. This dual role has brought with it special responsibilities which create tension between serving university program needs and serving national needs. And while many research libraries continue to support unique collections of major importance regardless of how directly they relate to current local university programs, this role is increasingly difficult to maintain.

In addition to these historical factors, collection development efforts are greatly influenced by a series of external forces beyond the control of libraries. As noted earlier, economic forces are the prime example, with stable or reduced purchasing power a temporary norm at most academic libraries. While this decline in fortunes may not be permanent, there are few strong indications of improvement in the near future. In any case, the resulting collection gaps are likely to be irremedial, or at least outrageously expensive to fill in later. It is difficult enough to maintain current collection strengths, without having to purchase retrospectively to any appreciable extent.

Probably the most influential forces are the political and program pressures coming from the university community. These forces are outgrowths of major shifts in undergraduate course enrollment, the initiation of new graduate programs, research grants in new areas, or simply the hiring of new faculty with unique research interests. Many libraries report that university administrators and faculty do not always appreciate the consequences to the library of these changes. For instance, they are reluctant or unable to provide the finances necessary to support the purchase of retrospective materials for a new doctoral program. Similarly, the emergence of new national research interests, such as energy or environmental science and engineering, does not typically lead to new infusions of money into the library budget.

Another complex issue involves the competing demands of research and instructional programs. In support of instruction, it is relatively easy to predict what level of holdings will satisfy the frequent needs of students involved in relatively well-defined areas of the curriculum. But, in research programs, individual users specialize in quite narrow topics, and the probability is extremely small that any particular research book will be frequently used. Yet, we know that a scholar or faculty member interested in that narrow topic can be persuasively insistent that the library absolutely must have a certain book if it is to call itself a research library. While, in one sense, this is an economic issue in which the library must decide how much of its limited resources it can spend on materials which will have only limited use, it is also a political issue that requires constant negotiation and subjective decisions. Many libraries have been forced by extended economic stress to shift the balance away from the more speculative needs of present and future scholars. While this shift may be unavoidable for many libraries, even desirable for some, librarians and scholars have pointed out some disturbing implications. The support of immediate needs frequently requires substantial expenditures for multiple copies of materials which have relatively limited

lifetimes. So, while satisfying immediate demands, these duplicate purchases add nothing to a collection's richness and become a burden when they have been replaced on course reading lists and begin to gather dust on the library's shelves. Beyond that, funds expended on duplicates are not available for acquiring unique research titles. The resulting deterioration of the research collection is, for all intents and purposes, irrevocable.

These generic problems have led to an increased awareness of the need for new approaches to collection development. On one level, we need better mechanisms for analyzing such external events as changing trends within the publishing industry and shifts in university program emphases. On another level, we need new ways to promote realistic expectations among the library's various client systems and an understanding of library needs among faculty and university administrators. Library directors also recognize that it is increasingly important to develop mechanisms which relate collections directly to university programs. Libraries are expending considerable effort in developing rational, written plans for collection growth--plans which define the scope and intensity of collections needed to support various university programs. These plans are intended as rational, descriptive blueprints for action. Typically, these plans make specific distinctions for levels of collecting by form and subject. They set priorities among collection areas and form the basis for allocation and selection decisions throughout the library. While such plans require periodic updating, the process can serve as the administrative vehicle for maintaining the library's awareness and responsiveness to changes in university programs.

Changes in budgeting methods are also needed, particularly in allocating materials funds. When there was relative plenty, incremental budgeting sufficed. Now that budgets are under considerable strain, however, libraries are being forced to examine what parts of their collections they can continue to support. Based on these hard decisions, they are developing new criteria for allocating funds. These criteria may not be entirely quantitative, since they may include consideration of political forces. But, whatever they are at a particular library, they form the basis for the fundamental budget decisions which will determine the future shape and dimensions of the collection.

It is also necessary that we find better means for assessing collection effectiveness. As resources have become more scarce, and collection decisions tougher, it has become increasingly important that libraries be able to determine how successfully their collections fulfill the program needs of their institutions. Libraries are working toward developing techniques for understanding the needs and behavior of library users, for establishing what it takes to fulfill their collection requirements, and for deciding how well they are currently doing it.

Even as libraries benefit from faculty advice and concern, it is essential that they maintain control over collection development. Many faculty are not bashful about promoting the need for strong, even comprehensive, collections in their particular areas. When the allocations to various university departments are published, it can lead to politically powerful expressions of dismay that some areas are over-supported at the expense of other--usually

their own--areas. But the cooperation of faculty in defining program needs and in assessing success is an important ingredient of collection development efforts.

There are also concerns of a more immediate and internal nature. In the staffing area, subject bibliographers and departmental librarians frequently, and understandably, develop a strong commitment to the specific areas they serve and often build strong support among their users. Of course this is all to the good, but only as long as they are supportive of the overall goals of the library. In any case, library administrators frequently find themselves negotiating among diverse political forces on their own staffs. This is perhaps most obvious in highly decentralized collections where there is considerable room for legitimate demands that overlap and duplicate and where a spirit of competition sometimes exceeds collaboration.

Finally, many librarians identify the need to continue current efforts at developing timely, equitable, and effective resource-sharing mechanisms. While much has been done in this area, libraries are working hard to develop ways to translate the promise of resource sharing into the reality of meaningful savings and improved access to research materials.

These are all very difficult challenges to research libraries, but I should not leave the impression that nothing is being done about them. Many ARL libraries are experimenting with new approaches to collection development. Some of these efforts stress the need to deal more effectively with the environment, others focus on such internal operations as allocation procedures and collection assessment. Still others emphasize the greater exploitation of existing resource-sharing opportunities. However, one difficulty in promoting change in the collection development function is the magnitude and complexity of the problem. It is obvious that we will need to address this complexity systematically. One approach to doing so will be described by the next speaker, Duane Webster.

# A CONCEPT OF COLLECTION ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT

Duane Webster

My task is to review the collection analysis procedure designed by the Office of Management Studies with the support of a grant from the Andrew Mellon Foundation. Jeffrey Gardner has already highlighted the issues that we encountered in an examination of ARL collection development practices. I will discuss some of the assumptions and concepts that influenced our procedural design, and then report on the status of the project.

So far, the project has involved: A Systems and Procedures Exchange Center survey of member libraries, twelve site visits to member libraries, meetings with collection experts, the establishment of an advisory committee, a review of such complementary projects as:

--The National Inquiry into the Production and Dissemination of Scholarly Knowledge

--The Machlup study of the Economic Viability of the Publication of Books and Journals in Scholarly Fields

--An Indiana study aimed at examining the internal dynamics of institutional decision-making for the selection of library materials in the humanities

--A collection analysis project at the Cornell University Libraries, and

--ALA committee efforts to prepare guidelines for the formulation of collection development policies,

and the operation of three pilot tests. Our goal has been to design a collection analysis procedure that research libraries could use to analyze their collection programs, in view of both the pressures of today's economic situation and the visible need to strenghten the research library role in university instructional and research programs.

Our effort has been influenced by several assumptions concerning the forces working for and against changes in the collection programs of research libraries. The first assumption is that limited funds require close attention to the management of collections in order to successfully meet user needs and maintain research collection strengths. With environmental pressures -- particularly financial pressures -- forcing libraries to review traditional approaches to resource allocation, it is important to be able to reallocate funds where this may improve effectiveness. Traditional book fund budgeting processes can be improved by relating available funds more closely to the collection development objectives which emerge as corollaries of institutional priorities. The success of a library's collection depends on its ability to meet institutional program needs. Libraries need better descriptive and analytical information to discern collection strengths and weaknesses, match

these against user needs and use patterns, and then relate their collection programs to the university's programs. Secondly, CAP assumes that the appropriate function of departmental and faculty representatives is to define -- through collection development and acquisition policies -- the limits within which the library staff should work. Implicit in this process is the recognition that librarians are the key element in the successful development of collections. Finally, CAP assumes that self-sufficiency is impossible for libraries, and that collections must be managed with regional and national needs in mind. Interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing must be integral parts of the planning.

To understand the project, it is helpful to see CAP as a conceptual and analytical framework for the rational analysis of research collections. A detailed description of the model is provided in the CAP manual, but briefly we can say that at the heart of the model are the library's collections which support university instructional and research programs. These collections are influenced by environmental factors such as user needs, student enrollment, faculty research interests, price trends, and new technology. Libraries attempt to shape their response to these university needs and environmental pressures by defining the scope, coverage, and intensity of their collection development activities in formal collection policies. The Library's acquisition program implements these collection policies by allocating resources and by organizing the staff in ways that best maintain the collection. The current acquisitions program in turn shapes and directs the growth of the research collection.

Pinpointing the relationships among these concepts is central to the program. The libray's collection philosophy is developed according to an understanding of the nature of university programs. The resulting collection development policy articulates the specific guidelines for the operation of the library collection function. Thus, library's collection development function, which includes the acquisitions program, is designed and operated in direct response to the collection development policy. In a general sense, the success of the library's collection program depends upon the strength of this relationship between policy and functional operations. To measure the success of the collection program, CAP tries to determine its ability to fulfill university program needs. Identification of deficiencies or weaknesses should lead to change in collection development policy, in the program of acquisitions, or both. With this model in mind, we have put together a methodology for analyzing and assessing the complex series of activities, events, and documents that go into the development and maintenance of research collections.

The Collection Analysis Project employs an assisted self-study method, in which representative library staff carry out the analyses with resources and advice provided by the Office of Management Studies. The self-study method involves a systematic review of current collection practices, leading to preparation of workable recommendations for change. The study is divided into two major parts. The first investigates, in a general way, library goals and objectives, environmental factors affecting collection development, and the historical development of the library's collection. The "goals and objectives review" identifies how objectives are established and followed and looks

at their suitability, particularly in the collection area. The "overview of environmental pressures for change" examines trends in resource sharing, scholarly publishing, higher education, economics, and university programs. In examining the historical development of the collection, the study notes the strengths and weaknesses of the collection as well as its physical dimensions and major components. These introductory investigations provide useful data on general aspects of the library's performance and also furnish background information for the second group of analyses.

After an "interim review of progress", the study goes on to analyze four specific aspects of the collection program in greater detail: operating practices, collection assessment, resource sharing, and preservation. The "review of collection development operating practices" looks at materials fund allocation, selection policy and practices, and organization and staffing patterns. The "collection assessment module" reviews the methods available for such an assessment, looks at the overall description of the collection, and then assesses portions of the collection. The project thus presents two basic approaches to collection assessment: "collection-centered assessment" and "client-centered assessment". The former treats the collection as a resource, irrespective of actual demand and use. It focuses on the intellectual breadth and depth of the collection and proceeds from the proposition that a research collection's value is intrinsically related to the unknown needs of future scholars. The latter approach, client-centered assessment, focuses on the actual utility of the collection to its current users. One important consideration is "accessibility", which refers to the ease and timeliness of user access to materials. Another is "availability", which refers to whether needed or desired material is actually in the collection. The "resource-sharing analysis module" examines the influence of evolving national and regional programs on the library's collection programs. Finally, the "preservation module" examines current activities, needs, and future prospects.

One study team and four task forces--all of them composed of library staff members--perform the self-studies. The study team conducts the initial general analysis, coordinates and manages the work of the task forces, and produces the final report with recommendations for change. Frequently, the library's chief collection development officer is chairperson of the group. The task forces conduct the more specific analyses in the second part of the study and report back to the study team.

The library director has a critical part to play throughout the project. After consultation with staff and university officials, the director first makes the final decision to participate. In addition, the director is responsible for selecting members of the study team, and for preparing a written charge to team members which presents the director's expectations in some detail.

The participation of university faculty is another critical element. Faculty can provide periodic feedback, particularly at the interim and final report stages, and they are given other opportunities to keep informed of the project's intentions, progress, and results. Much of the faculty input will be generated during the collection assessment phase, through a survey of the

faculty's needs and level of satisfaction and through a joint evaluation of specific parts of the collection by faculty-bibliographer teams.

Meanwhile, the OMS provides a series of resources to assist libraries in carrying out CAP. For example, OMS supplies a CAP manual, which has been designed so that it will be adaptable to a range of local differences. Although each library will want to make some specific adaptations, the manual should eliminate the need for the study team to spend large amounts of time on project design and enable it to focus on the actual review and analysis of issues and the development of recommendations for change. OMS is also developing supplementary written materials to assist in carrying out specific project tasks. These include data-gathering instruments, such as user surveys and interview guides, formats for analyzing and displaying data, and working papers dealing with such tasks as preparing the interim report, preparing the final report, and group decision-making. Finally, the OMS provides direct assistance and training for the study team, mainly through a series of on-site work sessions where the OMS staff assists in defining and resolving problems and in planning for the next study phases.

At this time, the self-study manual has been drafted and given to an advisory committee made up of library directors and collection development specialists. The committee has met once with the Office staff and is now reviewing the manual. Three libraries have been invited to participate in the pilot test of the CAP manual -- M.I.T., Arizona State, and the University of California at Berkeley. These libraries will assist us in refining and improving the project for future use by other research libraries. Each of these libraries is different, and should give us insight into the manner in which we may work with a different type of library. M.I.T., for example, is an established research library that has traditionally emphasized development of scientific and technical collections in a decentralized system. The university's more recent emphasis of social science programs and its development of strong interdisciplinary programs also offer some interesting challenges in the collection area. Arizona State, on the other hand, is an emerging research library whose materials expenditures have grown by 100% in the last five years. The Director and staff of Arizona State plan to use CAP to plan still further development. The University of California at Berkeley is one of the five largest ARL members and provides a test for the program in a very large, complex environment. In this setting, we can examine a professional school, an area study, or a specific aspect in the humanities. In addition, the rate of growth at Berkeley has been more typical than it has been at Arizona State, with materials expenditures increasing 31% over the last five years. Each of these participating libraries has been working on collection analysis and improvement projects in the past and is willing to contribute to the dual task of completing the collection analysis procedure and helping the OMS evaluate and improve its program.

The Mellon Foundation has granted a schedule extention so that the OMS may complete the pilot test and assess the results prior to determining future operations of the program. The new schedule calls for a report to Mellon on April 1, 1978. A meeting of the CAP Advisory Committee is tentatively planned for the latter part of February to review the results of the pilot tests, and

to advise the Office on future conduct of the program. By April, the Office hopes to have a plan for future operation of a collection analysis procedure.

In summary, the Collection Analysis Project should result in an increased understanding of the issues related to collection development on the part of the library staff and administration. It should also influence those critical groups on a university campus that have an impact on collection activities. The interim and final reports, as well as the task force reports, should provide both documentation that can be used for budget presentations and plans of action for future development of the library's collection activities. More importantly, the study will result in a series of specific recommendations for a new and improved approach to the operation of the library's collection development program.

## COLLECTION ANALYSIS IN A DECENTRALIZED SYSTEM

Jay Lucker

The decision to apply for inclusion in the ARL Collection Analysis Project was not a difficult one for the M.I.T. Libraries. When presented with the opportunity to be one of the pilot test sites, the Library administration, the staff, and the senior officers of the Institute were quick to realize the far-reaching impact that this study might have on long-range planning for collection development.

The participation of the M.I.T. Libraries in the pilot phase of ARL/CAP promises to be mutually beneficial because:

--Among ARL libraries, M.I.T. represents an institution with one of the highest levels of research activity

--M.I.T.'s highly decentralized library system provides an excellent testing ground for the viability of coordinated collection development

--The M.I.T. Libraries had already begun, under the direction of a recently appointed Collections Development Librarian, to collect relevant data and to develop system-wide collection policies

--A significant number of Library staff members have subject expertise and related professional experience, so that the project serves as an opportunity for professional development, and

--The Director of Libraries has a strong commitment to coordinated collection development and has, therein, the encouragement of the Institute's administration.

To carry out the project, the Director appointed a study team consisting of six members, chaired by Jutta R. Reed, Collections Development Librarian, who is here with us today. The Study Team has just completed an interim report on its activities to date, and much of what I will report this morning is quoted directly from that report. I am thus indebted to the Team members for their contributions.

The interim report concerns four major topics. First are the internal and external environmental factors which have a major impact on the Library System: the economic situation, university programs, cooperative efforts, publishing industry trends, and legislative developments. Second comes the historical development of the collections. Third, the report examines the operating assumptions that comprise the goals and objectives of the Institute and the Libraries, and fourth, the report considers the more specific task force analyses which will comprise the second stage of the project.

Task forces have been established in the areas of collection effectiveness, resource sharing, allocation, organization and staffing, and preserva-

tion. The task forces' primary responsibilities will be data collection, analysis, and the identification of optional approaches to critical issues facing the Libraries. The final reports of the task forces will provide the framework within which the Study Team makes recommendations to the Director of Libraries. Through the coordinated efforts of the Study Team and the individual task forces, the project will derive mechanisms for (1) formulating collection development policies, (2) determining the most effective use of financial resources, and (3) measuring the effectiveness of collection programs. It is the aim of the project, both to develop a blueprint for the future of the M.I.T. Libraries and to provide a self-study model which other research libraries can adopt.

At this point it might be useful to describe our approach to the staffing of the project. It was clear that a great deal of staff time would be required to carry out the objectives of the study. We decided at the outset that, even though it was necessary and desirable that a substantial number of staff participate in the program, it was essential that the Library's ongoing activities be disrupted as little as possible. Therefore, we decided to use a substantial portion of the project funds to provide the home libraries of Study Team members with the ability either to hire temporary personnel or to increase the hours of less than full-time staff as compensation for the loss of the services of the Team members. While their absence from regular duties, which has often amounted to half time, is not totally replaceable, this policy has produced an atmosphere of support which might not otherwise have been engendered. In addition, a portion of the grant was used to hire a temporary, full-time research staff assistant, who, working closely with the chairperson, has carried out detailed statistical analyses, conducted bibliographic research, and prepared background papers.

For those unfamiliar with M.I.T., here are a few facts about the Institute and the Libraries. M.I.T. is an independent, coeducational, privately-endowed university. It is broadly organized into five academic schools -- Architecture and Planning, Engineering, Humanities and Social Science, Management, and Science. There are 23 academic departments within these Schools, as well as many interdepartmental laboraties, centers, and divisions which extend beyond the traditional boundaries of a single department. The Library System's public services are highly decentralized, but the administration and processing are centralized. There are five large, divisional libraries roughly corresponding to the five Schools -- Engineering, Science, Architecture and Planning, Humanities and Social Science, and Management -- but there is no central or main library. There are three major branches in aeronautics, earth and planetary sciences, and music, as well as two reading rooms in chemistry and materials science. The latter are basically non-circulating duplicate collections. Other components are a 24-hour non-circulating reserve collection, the Institute Archives, and the Historical Collections, the last being our repository for Institute memorabilia such as photographs, instruments, models, portraits, and the like.

The Study Team has identified five key features that demonstrate the need for strategies and collection policies that respond to the unique composition of the Institute:

1. The fact that M.I.T. is a reseach university has a pervasive impact on the Libraries. On the one hand, the Libraries must build broad-based, in-depth collections to support the information needs of researchers. On the other hand, the nature of grant-supported research is contingent upon national priorities, and the Libraries must build dynamic collections and anticipate and respond to shifting research interests. In the light of financial constraints, the Libraries continually face difficult decisions in attempting to support emerging research projects, while, at the same time, maintaining emphasis on collections vital to the core of the Institute.

2. The growth of interdisciplinary research centers and educational programs affects the Libraries in critical ways. As departments have moved away from being unidisciplinary, and as the number of interdepartmental and inter-school laboratories and centers has expanded, the Libraries' traditional department- or school-oriented structure has undergone severe strains. For the user, such a structure creates problems in the form of dispersed and fragmented collections. For the Libraries, it results in overlapping collections and increasing duplication. Although the Libraries have begun to restructure collection responsibilities, user access to interdisciplinary materials remains a critical problem.

3. Although M.I.T.'s primary focus is in the fields of science and engineering, the eight departments in the Schools of Architecture and Planning, Management, and Humanities and Social Science are a vital part of M.I.T. Despite the imbalance in numbers and budgets among departments, the Libraries recognize the need to provide collections that support the excellence in research and educational programs in all departments.

4. The Libraries still feel the reverberations of the transition to limited growth after two decades of rapid growth in the Institute. For the Libraries, this transition to limited collection growth has had a pervasive impact: the acquisition of serials and monograhps has been reduced, newly published materials are now favored over retrospective materials, the duplication of serials and monographs is carefully monitored, less-frequently-used serial titles are being cancelled, and the selection of expensive titles is being closely reviewed and often postponed. The effects of the slow-down in acquisitions have also forced the Libraries to take a hard look at de-emphasized programs and to effect a higher degree of coordination and centralization to maximize limited resources.

5. The diversity of information needs of the different components of the Institute poses a continual challenge for the Libraries. Although the rigor and excellence of M.I.T.'s undergraduate education demand library collections at a more advanced level, undergraduate information needs differ from those of graduate students, faculty, and researchers. To insure user satisfaction, the Libraries must continually seek methods to provide balanced services to all components of the user population.

Although many of the developments at the Institute are outside the control of the Libraries, the M.I.T. Library System faces the challenge of responding to contending demands. As the pressures created by rising costs of library materials mount, the Libraries must endeavor to maintain an appropriate balance in support between research and educational programs, between sciences and engineering and the humanities and social sciences, between undergraduate and graduate studies, and between new and emerging interests and traditional programs.

In addition to the preceding analysis of the institutional context in which the Library functions, the Team made several assumptions concerning the economic outlook for the Libraries between 1978 and 1982:

1. There will be no significant real growth in the materials budget, except through some project-oriented gains.

2. The availability of substantial grants from foundations or the federal government is doubtful. There will be no significant increase in the endowment funds available to the Libraries.

3. Book and serial prices will continue to rise, but the rate of increase is expected to remain relatively constant. Cost increases will be higher in the sciences than in other fields.

The Study Team's analysis of the historical development of the collections indicates that a range of responses must be developed to meet the number of long-standing problems identified in the collections development process. Historically, these problems result from the lack of a coherent, responsive collection philosophy and are exascerbated by today's steady-state budgets and the pressures created by rising prices. They are further compounded by changes in, and the expansion of, educational and research activities at the Institute. Recognizing that the problems confronting collection development are complex and cannot be solved entirely all at once, the Study Team agrees that the resolution of specific problems must be sought in full consonance with the over-all priorities and objectives of the M.I.T. Libraries.

Through an analysis of existing written and unwritten collection objectives, the Study Team has identified a number of operating priorities for the Library's collections program. They are:

1. To develop collections in subject areas that support research and teaching at M.I.T. To assess user needs and provide, where necessary, balanced collections in those subject areas not actively pursued by members of the Institute.

2. To establish a comprehensive set of collection development policies for specific subjects with the long-range goal of developing coordinated collections.

3. To maximize available financial resources and space to meet this objective, the Libraries shall strive to control and limit growth

while concurrently meeting the needs of the M.I.T. community. The Libraries will optimize available space by housing less-used material in an off-campus resource-sharing center, and expand and enrich M.I.T.'s library collections through participation in local, regional, and national cooperative networks.

4. To resist, with few exceptions, becoming a library of record in any field, but to maintain collections in active academic and research areas. To reinforce this goal by actively weeding any superseded material while carefully maintianing collections that indicate a potential for future use.

In the second phase of the Collection Analysis Project, we will focus on:

1. Reconciling, in an over-all collection development philosophy, the critical divergence between buiding collections by subject and building collections based on departmental and School programs, the latter being the general approach taken by M.I.T. up to now.

2. Examining problems of access intrinsic to M.I.T.'s decentralized library system.

3. Developing a framework for responding to interdisciplinary research.

4. Developing mechanisms for a rational distribution of funds to Divisional Libraries, based on the Institute's over-all objectives.

5. Evaluating the information needs of all components of the M.I.T. community to determine appropriate levels of service for all groups.

6. Examining existing and emerging cooprative library networks and programs and determining the extent to which the M.I.T. Libraries can benefit from, and contribute to, large-scale national and regional cooperation, and

7. Determining priorities for the repair and restoration of library materials.

The published title of this presentation is "Collection Analysis of a Decentralized System." From the preceding you might agree that it could more appropriately have been titled "Collection Analysis in a Decentralized System Without a Central Library in an Institutional Setting of a High Volume of Sponsored Research, Many Interdepartmental Laboratories and Research Centers, and an Exponential Increase in Interdisciplinary Studies in an Era of Severe Financial Constraints."

Some of the benefits to M.I.T. of participation in the Collection Analysis Project have already been realized. I anticipate that, at the completion of the work, we will be able to see more clearly the future directions of collection and planning. We are indebted to the Association of Research Libraries for its intellectual and financial support and, most especially, to Jeffrey Gardner of the Office of Management Studies.

# PLANNING GROWTH IN AN EMERGING RESEARCH LIBRARY

Donald Koepp

There is a story about the tourist who asked the owner of an English country house how he managed to maintain such a magnificent green sward around the house. He replied: "Madame, it is very simple. One just plants it -- then rolls it -- and mows it -- and lets the rain water it -- for one hundred years." That story might, in some senses, be taken as the paradigm of the development of a research library collection. It helps enormously to have been around for one or two hundred years. That is not to say that there are not some very well-known disadvantages in that kind of antiquity, but I think this group would agree that, on balance, it does help enormously to have been around for a long time.

What if you have not had two hundred years? What if, as in the case of the institution which I represent, you have had approximately two decades? How much of a research collection is it possible to develop in that length of time? Is it really possible to plan the process? One reason we are involved in the Collection Analysis Project is to answer those questions. A substantial portion of the professional staff in the Library of Arizona State University is presently working very, very hard under the leadership of someone in this audience today to get answers to those questions. I am trying to say that I do not have the option that Library Directors frequently have when they are away from home. I cannot just make up answers to these difficult questions, so we will have to wait upon the final report of the Collection Analysis Project for them. But, there are some observations I can make without presuming to short-circuit what various committees on my campus are presently working so very hard to document.

First off, I doubt that we can absolutely generalize what the Project at Arizona State University will eventually have to say, even among other rapidly growing collections. Keyes Metcalf is fond of saying that "circumstances alter cases." Mr. Metcalf, in an intuitive fashion, was, long before it achieved its current popularity, simply endorsing what is now learnedly called "the contingency theory of organization." In essence, this theory proposes that effective organization relates the structure of the organization to the environment in which it exists. It follows that the difficulties of ineffective organizations can frequently be traced to an inadequate articulation of the organizational structure and environment. It also follows that the only circumstances in which any findings are precisely relevant to other institutions is when the circumstances are exactly the same. I doubt that that is often the case.

What characterizes the environment at Arizona State University? First of all, we must refer to its rapid growth. In the past twenty years, the student population has grown by 350 percent. The faculty has grown by 325 percent and is still growing. Meanwhile, the net assignable space has grown by 160 percent. Parenthetically, the space figure is very misleading, because most of the space which existed 20 years ago has, during that period, been removed and

replaced by new space. Further, this rapid growth exists in an institution with a rather aggressive spirit -- and not just on the football field. University status was achieved in 1958 as a result of a statewide referendum organized and managed by the Alumni Association with strong support from the then Arizona State College student body, faculty, and administration. The referendum approved the change to University status in spite of the opposition of the other state-supported university and of the legislature. That rather direct can-do spirit still pervades the institution. Finally, I suppose partly as a result of the two factors I have just mentioned, change is a way of life on this campus. Resistance to it is still there in some quarters but, by and large, it is not adamant. Change, both for better and for worse, can be achieved, given a modicum of real determination. Possibly because of rapid growth and a can-do spirit, it is very difficult to get anyone to take the time to agree to (or even disagree with) formal and comprehensive planning. You can achieve change fairly easily if you announce only the changes in procedure. The matter is considerably more difficult if you tell anyone what the changes in procedure are intended to accomplish.

How has the library fared in all of this? I would say that it has fared well, but I would also point out that the emphasis on "what part" of the library program was being developed has varied enormously during this twenty years. Obviously, if you start from ground zero, it is difficult to do everything at once -- even in an institution trying very hard.

1958-1962: I would characterize this as a period of shock. Not much got done as the Library organization tried to figure out what to do and contemplated the enormous task placed before it by the 1958 referendum.

1962-1970: Major energies were devoted to the planning and construction of new space. Book budgets were substantial, but growth was largely a matter of frantically acquiring anything and everything that the faculty felt was relevant. Considering that we started with very little that was relevant to the new doctoral programs, surprisingly few serious mistakes were made. Late in this period, the University embarked on the creation of a Law Library from groud zero.

1970-1973: Book budgets remained absolutely fixed at what, at the beginning of the period, was adequate funding. Obviously, at the end of the period, it was not adequate. However, absolutely essential increases in staffing were achieved, and the total FTE staffing increased from 118 to 180, excluding student assistant FTE. As this period came to a close, the growth of the collection was the focal point of much dissatisfaction. Some factions on campus felt that frivolous nonsense was being purchased and refused to support requests for additional funds. Other factions protested loudly that not enough funding was available for acquisitions and that funding was being wasted on staffing.

1973 to the present: Given sufficient staffing and blessed with a functional and adequate building, major emphasis has been placed upon a controlled development of the collection. Whether these efforts have been successful is a matter we hope to assess through CAP.

As noted above, this focus on the collection has involved an emphasis on procedures, with a muting of concern for the policy implications of any resulting procedural changes. The book budget has increased by 121 percent since 1973, though other aspects of collection development have been considerably less flamboyant. During the same period, all departmental allocations have been discontinued with no protest whatever. We have developed an apparatus within the library structure which screens requests for their relevance to teaching and research programs at the University, and no one gets very upset when we refuse to purchase. We are not necessarily pleased with this lack of protest, because periodic protests serve to remind the administration that we are not routinely purchasing everything the faculty request. The personnel assigned to this screening apparatus also have general responsibilities for the development of the collection. In other words, they do not just respond to faculty-initiated requests. No overall collection development policy exists, largely because no one wants to seriously consider the proposal that a long stretch of time be spent on something which could be so easily outdated through changes in University programs. However, we have developed a series of policies with respect either to specific troublesome aspects of collection growth or to particular formats. Understandably, a very heavy emphasis has been placed upon the articulation of how local growth can be coordinated with resources available to us off campus. Much of the refusal to purchase is based upon availability through the Center for Research Libraries or other sources.

Questions about the rate of collection growth have been very much a campus concern. Two committees of the academic senate have investigated the matter in the past four years, and part of my interest in participating in the Collection Analysis Project stems from my wish to involve librarians, as opposed to the rest of the faculty, in a highly visible consideration of this matter. (Parenthetically, I am also interested in this project because I am tired of suggestions from both faculty and library staff that we start doing something which we have been doing for three or four years or that we quit doing something that we quit doing long ago. I would hope that the project will provide us a firm basis from which realistic and informed proposals can be made about how we should change our procedures or the philosophy on which these procedures are based.)

It is too early for us to speak authoritatively to the question of whether the Collection Analysis Project will accomplish these ends. Right now, a little less than two months into the project, the outlook is very favorable. Thanks to the invaluable assistance we have received from the Office of Management Studies and to the enregetic approach of Arizona State University Librarians, we appear to be well along toward a documentation of the current situation and its antecedents. I look forward to the recommendations for further change which will emerge from this review.

# ANALYZING A LARGE, COMPLEX RESEARCH COLLECTION

Shelia Dowd
University of California, Berkeley

Jeffery spoke truly enough when he said that the three of us represent quite different characters. We do in a million ways, I think. I have to say, parenthetically, that I really was feeling quite bucked up at being invited to address this august club. I am what we, in the trade, call a working librarian, you know. I was feeling pretty good until Richard told me on the plane the real reason for my inivitation. He said you will go to any length to keep him off this podium. You have succeeded. Now let us see if you regret it.

Berkeley is the latest recruit to the CAP Project. We are really just beginning our involvement, so I want to tell you why we are in it and what I hope we will be gaining from it. I cannot point to accomplishments already achieved, as Jay has done.

Several of us at UCB have been interested in the CAP Project since we first heard of it at the last ALA Midwinter Meeting. In fact, I have been a member of the Advisory Committee of the Project since almost that time. You might wonder, then, why we were so slow in joining. I can only say that advice is cheap. I am always willing to give it. Committing an institution to a long and costly project that unabashedly advertises itself as taking quarter to half of the time of key members of the staff for several months is a serious decision, and it is one that the University Librarian had to weigh carefully. His associates and I had to weigh it, and we had to consult our staff and make sure that everyone agreed this was warranted.

Some of our doubts about the validity of joining the project stemmed from the fact that we are not really at Day One in collection planning. Who is? But we especially are not right now. We cannot really give the Project a tabula rasa on which to inscribe a reform, because we are already in the middle of a partial investigation and reform, a very extensive one. We are developing a collection development policy statement. At the point at which we are creeping up on our five millionth volume, it may seem a little late to say we are developing a policy statement, but I do not think I have to tell the directors of large research libraries about that problem. We have attempted to develop collection policy statements in the past, but these efforts have been ineffective for two reasons. Either they have been quite generalized, rather sweeping statements that encompassed large subject areas over even at their most precise, or they have been "how-I-do-it" statements from individual units, what the music library does, what the documents department does -- without any coordination, any editing, or even any imprimatur from the Librarian's office. Neither of those add up to what I think we have all come to think of as a collection policy statement.

Now, with staffing support provided by the Sloane-Mellon grant for Stanford/Berkeley cooperation, we have been able to dedicate enough staff to this project to really launch a very extensive collection policy statement

project. The structure we are using in this endeavor was proposed in the ALA/RTSD Collection Development Committee Guidelines for the Formulation of a Collection Policy Statement, which were mentioned earlier this morning. They were published in LRTS in the winter of 1977. That is our basic conceptual approach, and it involves a detailed analysis of our collection development activities organized by about 1500 LC classification segments. We have tried to standardize the language, as those Guidelines suggest, so that our selectors are reporting on the level and kind of collections we are maintaining, and they are giving us information on the languages, the geographic areas, the time spans, and the strengths and weaknesses of the collection. We have received responses from all of our selectors, and are now coordinating these responses into an institutional policy which will both define our collecting goals and assign responsibility for their accomplishment in each class. We do not have that grand illusion that we can totally avoid duplication, but we hope that, in the future, it will be knowledgeable duplication and that the duplicator will know someone else has primary responsibility for the class. This is a Herculean effort in itself, and our time schedule requires that we complete it by May of 1978. At that time, we are also obliged to formally coordinate this document with a comparable document from Stanford.

Obviously, a project of this scale has already demanded a good deal of time and energy from all of the staff engaged in selection at Berkeley. At last count, we had over 60 librarians with some responsibility for selection. Since we were unwilling to undertake any additional commitments that would delay the completion of the project, it seemed, at first consideration, to rule out the possibility of Berkeley's being a useful participant in the Collection Analysis Project. When Duane Webster came to Berkeley to discuss CAP, he addressed two meetings attended by a large number of library staff. In the course of those meetings, the relevance of the project to our current activities and future goals became clearer to many of us. We saw that it could set our current efforts in a needed framework and give a direction to our plans for implementing the collection development policy statement.

The CAP manual's first phase includes a broad survey of institutional goals and objectives, an historical view of collections, the formulation of a collection policy statement, and the definition of its relation to academic programs. These are, in fact, necessary elements of the collection development policy statement we are currently working on. They are elements prescribed as introductory parts of that statement by the Guidelines that I mentioned earlier. So, in its first phase, the CAP manual actually offers a structure to help us accomplish ends which we had already recognized as necessary. It also supplies a methodology which we had not evolved. I frankly confess that I had foreseen that whole introduction, that whole enormous compilation of data about our institution, being largely done by me. The day that it dawned upon me that a study team might do a better job was the day when I became very positive about the CAP Project.

The second phase of the project promises to take us considerably beyond any point our current thinking has reached. It is obvious that, when you have undertaken a careful definition of collecting responsibility in a large and complex library system, you are going to raise some hard questions. One of

the questions is: "Does our fund allocation match this assigned pattern of responsibility?" Like many libraries, I think our present book budget combines a little bit of wisdom and a lot of historical assumptions. Another inescapable question is whether our distribution of staff is realistic in view of these collecting goals. As we have had all of our selection librarians conferring with each other and analyzing their own collection policies, these questions have come intrinsically to their minds. They are no longer simply academic questions. A third recurrent question is: "How do we test our assumptions about the quality of our collections?" I like the phrase Jeffrey uses: "How do we test our collection effectiveness?", because that is a two-headed monster. There is both the quality of the collection, viewed objectively as a shelf list, and the quality of the retrievable collection, the quality of the deliverable collection -- a very complicated thing to analyze. Phase II of the CAP Project at least tackles the question of evolving methodologies, which I think is a help. It offers us a chance to provide the staff with a "distributed understanding" of these problems. It gives us a chance to elicit from them carful and responsible proposals for solutions.

We expect, in the second phase, to appoint task forces to study fund allocation and the organization and staffing of the selection process. We see two separate task forces there. We see that whole question as too large for one. We will also need a task force for the evaluation of collections. Obviously they will not evaluate our 5 million books, but they will, I hope, tackle the evaluation of certain kinds of collections for certain purposes. The study team will have to think further about preservation and resource sharing. I am not sure how deeply we will go into those, because we had done surveys in those areas at Berkeley not very long ago, and will have to settle, I think, largely on an update of those surveys for those elements of the project.

After our staff had attended Duane's meetings in Berkeley, we followed the meetings by asking them to comment on the advisability of our participation in the Project. We got very mixed reactions. Some advised jumping in, some thought we should let others "pilot" the project while we used its benefits later. That is a very popular point of view on almost every question, I think. Everyone agreed that the time specifications of the project were unfeasible for us, and that the Project would need a little stretching to accomodate us. But, there was also very strong evidence that a large number of the concerned staff believed that the problems addressed in the collection Analysis Project were problems which must be confronted at Berkeley in the near future. The interest and momentum already generated by the policy statement must lead us directly to a consideration of the hard parctical questions surrounding the allocation of staffing if the policy statement is to have any meaning for the people who have worked so hard on it. The sense of urgency conveyed in these responses seemed to say that our staff was ready to undertake some further assessment of our collection functions. Given this assurance, the library administration concluded that we would be wise, if the schedule of the experiment could be adjusted, to avail ourselves of the help which OMS is able to offer. I am happy to say that we reached a modus vivendi on the schedule, so we are in the project.

You might ask, "What's in it for OMS?" To have us "standing with hesitating feet where brook and river meet" for so long must have been a bit of a drag for them. Well, one thing we offer them is a chance to test their program in a large and not always perfectly wieldy institution, an institution which has its share of structural oddities based on institutional history or personal idiosyncrasies, an institution which has an urgent need to define its goals for a diverse and demanding public which increasingly wants us to account for our collection activities vis-a-vis their specialties. In other words, we offer Duane something really quite special: We offer him a "worst possible case" test. We also offer him a strong staff -- I am going to say this without apology. We offer him a strong staff which has learned to work very well in the collegial mode, and I think we can do a good job on the project. I think we can help contribute to the development of a useful manual.

Already we have implanted the idea that some large institutions have their own time sense. I am pointing out to Duane that it is no accident that the University of California has chosen a hymn as its official hymn, and that hymn is the one that has the lines: "A Thousand Ages in Thy Sight Are Like an Evening Gone." That really characterizes us.

I think we will probably have some advice to give about the apportionment of time and energy to the various elements of the project, about areas that we think need more or less emphasis as we proceed. This is probably not something which can ever be generalized though. Each institution will have to tailor the project to its own concerns, but I suspect that we will have some wise advice.

Already my deep concern with the whole question of collection development policy statements makes me feel that that element in the manual has perhaps been treated too lightly. I am not going to give you any more clues to what I plan to tell Duane and Jeff over the next year, because I want you to buy the book.

MR. HAMLIN (TEMPLE): I seem to get, as a background of what has been said this morning, a very considerable emphasis, which I would not dispute at all, that the collection policy should be based on the educational aim and programs of the institution. I want to make a plea for emphasizing the responsibility of the library to lead in collection development in certain situations rather than to follow acknowledged patterns of graduate study. Perry Danton's book on book collection paints quite a utopian picture of the institution. All the librarian has to do is get the institution to set down its aims and objectives for the next 25 years, then the library sits down and writes out the collection program, and why doesn't everybody do it? We all know that aims and objectives of the institution change about like the weather, and the theory is fine, but the practice is poor.

At Temple, at least two of the programs which are good in collection development really developed in the library staff, one of them with some knowledge of faculty interest but without any emphasis. One of them is our collection of underground literature, or, to use a more polite term, alternative press, radical left and radical right. We went into that pretty fast, and, as we gathered more material, the interest of various departments which we had not even conceived of, developed. The thing spread, and it became very important on our campus. At present, we are also going moderately, but emphatically, into the book arts, without any great encouragement from the faculty. We are certain that it will eventually contribute greatly to the programs in a number of schools. Occasionally it happens that a library gets a gift, as we did in science fiction, and builds on that. So, I want to make an emotional plea, if I may, and get any comment from you, on our responsibility to lead in certain cases and not just follow.

MR. McDONALD (CONNECTICUT): Jeffrey Gardner alluded to the well-known impact that an academic program has on a library: the changes in undergraduate offerings, new graduate offerings -- particularly at the doctoral level, and new research interests such as energy and environment. Of course, these will have an effect upon our collecting activities.

What I want to know, Jeffrey, is whether the project has yet encountered any evidence of program retrenchment rather than growth in academic programs, whether, in this age of scarcity that Professor Dell referred to, the faculty are paying any attention to trying to phase out those courses which are no longer, shall we say, popular or necessary. I wanted to ask whether there is a significant reduction in programs, which may assist the library and its staff in reducing expenditures. I do not mean the kind of Draconian measures taken in the State University of New York, necessarily, but something a little more rational and self-imposed.

MR. GARDNER: There is not a lot of evidence of that, John. I sense that maybe there has not been a lot of evidence in your experience, from your comments. One thing Harry Dell mentioned that might indeed occur is that, if accountability in higher education continues to become a greater concern among

legislatures, you may see some of those changes forced in the curriculum. But, particularly among tenured faculty, there is a great deal of reluctance to shift either curriculum or research interests. In another couple of months, when these pilot studies start finishing, we may have a better grasp on that issue. But I do not see a lot of retrenchment going on.

MS. DOWD: I would just like to say that, in the collection development policy statements we are getting from our selectors, they have identified collections which were previously kept at a "research level" that they now believe we should drop to a "study level", as we are terming it. That is not unheard-of at all. It is very visible in a field like engineering, where the curriculum at Berkeley has changed radically. It has moved from a practicum field to a field that gives more doctorates than any other in the University, and the shift in what they are studying is visible in the responses. It is definitely happening. Unfortunately, there are more new programs than dying ones. It is like serials.

MR. SCHMIDT (SUNY ALBANY): I am from the State University of New York, and having been victimized by Draco, I now have McDonald to worry about too. I suppose we have been through something in the State University that might be interesting to the rest of you, so I will share some observations about the collection implications of dramatic, rather than Draconian, program reductions.

There are, it seems to me, two dimensions in the thinking on our campus that control or influence the amount of net gain you can make in your collection resources as a result of program terminations. The first concerns the question of whether you are taking a rifle shot at a specific program that is in a cluster of disciplines. In my case, after two years of academic program priority committees, we did terminate an entire astronomy department -- doctoral program gone, master's degree program gone, and undergraduate major phased out. The question that was obviously in my mind, and would be in yours, were you in my office, was, "What kind of collection resources is that going to release?" In fact, it did not release very much. The science bibliographer did an analysis of what seemed to be narrowly defined as "materials in support of the astronomy program". Then she began to deal with the people in the Department of Atmospheric Science, some of the physicists, some of the mathematicians, and you know the rest of the story. I think the realities here are that the University, for its reasons, took a small piece out of an interrelated cluster of disciplines, and that approach produced a negligible net gain in collection resources.

The second dimension is the extent to which there are "horizontal linkages" operative among the faculty that cross departmental, sectional, or divisional lines. To some extent, this is also a derivative of the cluster principle, but it is also a somewhat different question: "Do you have an associate professor or a professor whose appointment is really in political science, although he happens to occupy an endowed chair in sociology? And in the Ed School, connecting with departments in social and behavioral sciences, and so on?" To the extent that that is going on -- and, in an optimal circumstance, that is a highly desirable kind of linkage -- you are going to get relatively little net gain in collection resources as a result of program reductions.

Those two things lead to a kind of dismal prospect for releasing collection resources, and I do not know how you solve the problem, unless you really do become Draconian and take out not only a member of a family of disciplines, but the whole family.

MR. EDELMAN (CORNELL): Among the constants in Duane's list of environmental variables was the need for information on the book and journal market on a worldwide basis. The study teams in each of the universities undergoing CAP will seek that information by looking at the Bowker data and the Clasquin data, and they will try to interpret them through numerous hours of very frustrating work. Since this is a constant, and since this information is needed for each institution, and for each study team on a year-to-year basis, may I suggest that your office take the initiative in seeing how this information might be analyzed nationally or internationally? It would save an immense amount of work if this could be done as the Germans, the French, and the British have done it and the information released annually to the research library community.

MR. WEBSTER: An interesting point, Henk. Based on our work with the Management Review and Analysis Program, we created the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center some time ago to provide information on management practices in research libraries. Through our involvement in CAP, we are going to get a better handle on exactly what analytical inforamtion of this kind our member libraries need. It could well be that we will recommend that ARL dispense this kind of collection development information on a permanent basis. I am not prepared to conclude that yet, but we are certainly tuned in to the problem.

MR. ROUSE (OKLAHOMA STATE): The concern I want to mention will not apply to everyone here and certainly will not be extremely popular in this group, but no one has said anything about the growing number of volumes in our collections and the problems we are going to face (or already face) because of this. It seems we are somewhat obsessed with the magic of numbers and doing very little about it. To speak objectively, I turned in ARL statistics a year or so ago showing a very reduced number of net volumes added, and I received a litte comment on this. What we did that year was to form a task force of the staff to consider removing obsolete, little-used materials from the collection. It was a weeding project, if you will, much like those they carry on in public libraries. We took out multitudinous volumes, multiple copies of reserve-type materials of 1930's vintage. We made a lot of space on our shelves, and we need that space very badly. I do not care how badly we look in the statistics, we think our collection is better for it. I would urge you to give this some consideration in all libraries.

MR. WEBSTER: In my description of the procedure, you might recall that there is one section on operating practices, in which we look at the selection process. Inherent in that consideration is the whole question of deselection. What are the policies? What are the practices? What needs to be changed? What do we need to consider? Certainly deselection must be as important in the design of collection policy as is selection. Particularly in view of the increasing emphasis on serving instructional needs through the use of

duplicates, there is going to be considerable value in tuning the collections. It is already a part of the program, but, in my discussion, I did not have a chance to cover it.

MR. KOEPP: I would certainly assume that the collection assessment part of the project include an evaluation of the amount of irrelevant material in the collection.

MR. MOSHER (STANFORD): I would like, in the first place, to second Henk's request that ARL provide us with some annual statistics on cost-rise data for scholarly materials. It really is a lack at present. We all need it badly, and we all do it independently, so it would be very helpful to have it done by some central source.

Second, we are really talking about managing library collections much like we manage staff or other facilities in libraries, and this is an approach that has not been used in the past. One of the aspects I have not heard talked about, probably because it is very difficult, is the kind of thing that Fritz Machlup asked about in his rather tactless but, in a way, rather helpful survey. He pointed out to us that we know what we ought to do subjectively at best, but most of us do not really know what, in fact, we are doing. I would hope that, in addition to urging the development of collection development policy statements, which are, in fact, statements of what we ought to do, we would spend some time discovering ways and techniques of managing what we actually do, program by program, field by field, and even subfield by subfield.

I would say that the shelf list measurement project that has been carried out among several research libraries is one step in the right direction. But I would hope we could do something even more practical and more widespread in the long run, so that we really do know how much money we are spending, and how many titles (or how many volumes) we are adding in a way that tells us whether we are doing what is supposed to be done. From this, we might learn what we can do about it area by area.

MR. BOES (GEORGIA): One of the large cost centers in collection development is special collections, specifically manuscripts or archival collections. I would hope that, in the studies that will be done, this area would be looked at especially. Often it works in its own vacuum.

MR. LUCKER: I think we are very much conscious of that. We have just started a major program at M.I.T. of collecting both the Institute's official records and the personal papers of scientists and engineers connected with the Institute. One of the aims of the Collection Analysis Project at M.I.T. will be to relate the development and growth of these papers with the development and growth of the printed book collections. We hope to emphasize how the conventional collections will support the use of these manuscripts, because, particularly in our case, we cannot justify that kind of investment unless we can tie it into the educational and research programs. With our very small rare book collection of about 50,000 volumes, we have to find some way to correlate its development with our overall collection policy. I think it is a very good

point and it is one that I picked up in reading the interim report from the study team. It is certainly one that I will interject back in my discussion with them.

One procedural matter that has not come out: As the process is now working, the interim report of the study team is made available to the Director of Libraries. Next, the Director meets with the study team to see whether it is moving in the right direction. I am pleased to say that, at least from my point of view, our study team is going very much in the right direction. But its interim meeting will give me an opportunity to point out that special collections is one area needing more emphasis in the next phase of the work.

VICE PRESIDENT FRANTZ: I have often thought that rare books and manuscripts might well be a topic for a program. It would at least have the virtue of our centering on books, learning, and research.

MR. DUDLEY (UCLA): I wanted to ask Duane just how OMS plans to publicize the results of this program. What sort of progress reports will be published and when?

MR. WEBSTER: As you know, we have met already with the collection development officers from large research libraries. We expect that, as the pilot studies are completed, we will make the reports from those studies available to the profession generally.

We would hope, of course, that the manual will be available for general distribution at some point. Certainly the way it stands now, we feel it needs to be tested and revised through actual operational experience before we can make it available for widespread distribution.

In terms of progress reports, the ARL Newsletter, ARL meetings, and the Minutes from these meetings will be available.

MR. ANDERSON (COLORADO STATE): During the presentation, some references were made to the "effectiveness" of the collection development practices. One of the components of effectiveness certainly is "use". I wonder if Duane or Jeff would comment on the method that will be used to assess this.

MR. WEBSTER: We have built study of user attitudes and perceptions into the program. We attempt to gauge their feeling of the relative level of satisfaction and their perception of the success of the library in meeting their needs. Secondly, we are going to attempt some analysis of circulation data within the "client-based assessment activity," providing the participating library has an automated circulation system. At least those two techniques will be employed: an attitude survey and a manipulation of available circulation data.

MR. GARDNER: At last one of the pilot institutions is considering some actual observation of user behavior. Part of what we want to get at is the issue of availability. We want some statistical sense of the percent of user requests

that are actually fulfilled. We also want some sense of when they are not fulfilled, and why. I think, at M.I.T. in particular, they are really going to be concerned with the accessibility issue. Assuming that the material is available in the collection, how accessible is it to their users? I think Jay has indicated some of the real problems that have been created by a large rise in interdisciplinary studies, a highly decentralized system, et cetera, et cetera. I think we will probably try some techniques there.

I think this topic has been the most difficult for us to deal with, in terms of putting the manual together.

VICE PRESIDENT FRANTZ: I would like to express my deep appreciation -- I know I speak for all of us -- to the members of the program this morning.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

# TWENTY YEARS OF THE COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES

William Dix

Librarian Emeritus, Princeton University

RAY FRANTZ: It is indeed a great pleasure to have our speaker and colleague with us again this evening. William Dix is too well known to us for me to list his honors or the contributions he has made to the profession while Librarian at Princeton and now as Librarian Emeritus, but I will mention two things. He was first Chairman of the Board of Directors of ARL when ARL was reorganized in 1962, and he has also served for some years on the Board of the Council on Library Resources. Since the Council has now completed 20 years of service, we have asked him to speak to us tonight about the work of the Council and what that work has meant to us. We are delighted that he has accepted.

MR. WILLIAM DIX: It is a great pleasure to be back in the ARL, which I have always thought vied with the Senate of the United States as the best club of its size in the country. It is a pleasure to be back in this capacity, especially now that you get a chance to finish your dinner. Steve McCarthy will remember in the old days when he was Exective Secretary -- and I was Executive Secretary before Steve -- that the principal duty of the Executive Secretary was to collect the cost of the dinner from each of the diners on these occasions, on the principle that if you let ARL Directors get away after eating, you would never get the money again. Some of you will remember how the Secretary had to go around and try to get money out of people, and there were always these scoundrels from public institutions who had to have receipts in the middle of this while you were trying to get your dinner. So, it is good to be back and to finish your dinner.

This occasion somehow became inflated a little bit. I was asked if I would make a few remarks about the Council, and the next thing I knew it was billed as the Keynote Address. I feel like the boy orator of the Platte or something of the sort. Anyway, I will try to say something about the Council on Library Resources.

The origins of the Council are obscured by the mists of antiquity, or, as some might say, blurred by the fumes of bourbon. At the dinner each year for the CLR management interns, it is fast becoming a tradition for Fred Cole and Louis Wright, the Chairman of the Intern Committee, to reminisce a bit. One of their recollections of a critical moment in the birth of the Council somehow involved a bottle of Old Heaven Hill bourbon that just happened to be in the bottom drawer of someone's desk. Since the story changes a little each year, and since, in my parochial way, I had never heard of Old Heaven Hill, and since Louis Wright is not only a distinguished historian but also an accomplished raconteur and myth-maker, I was inclined to catalogue this episode as folklore rather than history. But last year, driving up through South Carolina, that Arcadia from which Louis Wright came, and finding supplies

running low, I pulled in at a convenient oasis. The man in line before me at the counter said to the clerk, "Sir, I wants a pint of that Old Heaven Hill." This chance incident settled the whole thing. One cannot quarrel with the facts of history. If Old Heaven Hill is a fact, then it follows, as the night the day, that the Council on Library Resources was baptized with that heavenly fluid.

History is sometimes recorded in two forms -- a public version and a secret version. It was Louis Wright, again, who edited William Byrd's Secret History of the Dividing Line, and he is the author, with Fred Cole, of the "Secret Oral History of the Council". But he does write public history too. In the autobiography of his professional life, Of Books and Men, published last year, he tells more of the origins of the Council. You may remember that Dr. Wright says: "The Ford Foundation at that time -- 1955 -- was being bombarded by requests from libraries for grants. It seemed desirable to have some agency that could receive such requests, determine their worth, and fund them, if possible. Fred C. Cole, who was at the time on leave from Tulane University as a consultant for the Ford Foundation, came to me with the problem. The Ford Foundation would make a small grant to the Folger Library if we would convene a body of scholars, scientists, and librarians to discuss ways and means of solving some of the problems faced by research libraries and then make a report to the Foundation."

As I remember that first meeting at the Folger on January 15, 1955, there was a lot of loose talk and proliferation of wild schemes. I have observed that when librarians are confronted with the possibility of wealth beyond their dreams, they have a tendency to panic. Scholars are even worse, of course. Another meeting was held, followed by a flood of written suggestions. Dr. Wright's Non-secret History continues the story: "Someone had now," he says, "to digest the material and shape it into a practical proposal that would be acceptable to the Ford Foundation. On a hot July day, Fred Cole met me on the top deck of the liner United States as I was about to sail for Europe." Perhaps it was here that the christening of the Secret Oral History took place. "For two hours, until sailing time, we discussed every angle of the report. In the end I agreed to submit a draft proposal, which I wrote crossing the Atlantic and sent back by air mail to my secretary for retyping. This version, worked over by Fred Cole, W. McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation, and myself, became the charter of the Council on Library Resources, which the Ford Foundation agreed to sponsor with an initial grant of $5 million."

I have taken the time to recount all of this because I am not sure that everyone, even in the ARL, understands the part Fred Cole has played in the Council. Some may think that when he left the presidency of Washington and Lee in 1968 to become CLR President upon the retirement of Verner Clapp, he was approaching a direct involvement in national library affairs for the first time. On the contrary, it was Fred Cole who saw that something like the Council was needed, who first took steps to bring it into being, and who has served continuously on its Board of Directors from the beginning.

It is impossible even to summarize here the activities and achievements of the Council, of course. In the Annual Report for 1976, which is really a 20-year report, Nancy Gwinn does an admirable job of summarizing. Yet, even in almost one hundred pages of fine print, such an important Council-sponsored project as Keyes Metcalf's great Handbook of Academic and Research Library Architecture can be squeezed in only as a footnote. Thus, rather than talk about the success or failure of specific projects, I would like to give a brief personal view of the Council, as seen from the point of view of a library director, an ARL and ALA officer, a CLR Board member for a good many years, and, more briefly, a part-time CLR staff member.

What is the Council on Library Resources, then? The popular view, I suppose, is that, like all foundations, it is a rich uncle ready to hand out money to worthy applicants. It is true that CLR does make grants in support of activities that originate outside the Council. In the six months before the last Council meeting in June, twelve officer's grants were made. Limited grants can be made without Board action. Of these twelve, ten were in response to new, outside proposals, although several obviously had roots in earlier CLR activities. In the same six months, 42 other proposals were carefully considered and rejected, and 58 more were so completely out of scope that they had to be rejected immediately. The ability to find support for a small meeting of the right people to pull together the loose ends of a timely subject or to fund experiments with an innovative mechanized procedure in a single library have certainly been considerable benefits to the library community in the last 20 years. Yet, from the beginning, CLR was not conceived of as a passive organization merely reacting to outside proposals. Many of its major programs have been the product of a kind of symbiosis between CLR and some outside group, with the initial idea often, but not always, coming from the Council, and the funding coming from the Council or, in many instances, from a combination of sources put together by the Council. The activities usually were carried on outside the Council. Upon looking up the word "symbiosis" in my desk dictionary, I find the definition really quite apt. "The living together of two species of organisms. A term usually restricted to cases in which the union of the two animals or plants is not disadvantageous to either or is advantageous or necessary to both." I stop quoting the dictionary there, for it goes on to say: "As in the case of the fungus and algae which, together, make up the lichen." I have no desire to be put in the position of deciding which party is the fungus.

From the beginning, the possibility of even more direct action has been kept in reserve. A laboratory operated directly by CLR to tackle some of the technical problems affecting libraries has been discussed off and on through the years but has never been implemented because what seemed to be better means of accomplishing the same ends have always been found. But, with its status as a private operating foundation under the Tax Reform Act of 1969, CLR can, when necessary, act unilaterally. For example, to break the logjam and get started toward an international machine-readable catalogue of serials, the management of the CONSER project was placed in the CLR offices.

This flexibility of procedure, this ability to act, and its relatively small size are certainly among the factors which have made CLR so effective as

an agent for change. This is a cliche phrase which I do not like very much, for it seems often to suggest that all change is good. But it does, I think, apply to the Council. The product of much that it has tried has been change -- in methods and procedures, in physical procedures, even in people themselves.

All of this talk about flexibility and size has been really a kind of stalling, because I am timid about approaching the real secret of CLR's success. Now we must enter the corridors of power and open the closed doors. These are really both metaphors. There is only one long corridor at Suite 620, Number One Dupont Circle, and by inviolate custom all doors opening onto it are always left open. At any rate, where have the ideas come from? Who has made the decisions? For anyone who has watched the process work, that is a ridiculously easy question: From the two Presidents, Verner Clapp and Fred Cole, of course.

Verner was an admirable choice for the first President of the Council. An activist, in the sense that he was never afraid to make decisions without wasting a lot of time in committee meetings, he immediately set about attacking the most obvious problems which confronted research libraries. An inveterate tinkerer, he was determined to improve all of those gadgets which could improve library work, from a box in which to mail books in an interlibrary loan to computer hardware that might be made to perform library tasks more effectively. Many of us here remember the passion and the persistence with which he personally attacked the problem of disintegrating book papers, or that marvelous combination of Cataloguing in Source and the Cataloger's Camera. His intimate knowledge of the great national libraries, particularly the Library of Congress, helped him see that they were the key to much that needed to be done in national and international bibliographic control. He then found ways, as his successor has done, to stimulate sometimes reluctant bureaucracies into productive and even collaborative action. It is not a felonious exaggeration to say that, with the exception of the NPAC program, which happened to take a different direction, every major bibliographic innovation of the past 20 years has had some, often critically important, CLR participation. This has been a unique and fruitful partnership. Verner sometimes may have frightened friends of the Council by an occasional lack of diplomacy, but he firmly established the role of CLR and, to a considerable extent, its procedures in a way that hardly anyone else at the time could have done.

As I have already explained, when Fred Cole was elected President of the Council upon Verner's retirement, he was by no means an outsider. Yet he was not a librarian. His years of experience as a scholar sitting in the central academic administration of universities seems to have enabled him to perceive some things that Verner did not see or perhaps took for granted. Fred Cole perceived, for example, that academic libraries were not pulling their full weight in the instructional program and that they were not adequately integrated with the formal educational process. He saw also that an essential ingredient in helping libraries reach their full potential was the stature and, indeed, the status of librarians. So, he conceived and put into effect that remarkable group of CLR programs concerned primarily with professional

development -- the fellowship program, the management intern program, the Library Service Enhancement Program, the salary studies begun by Scotty Cameron, the ARL Office of Management Studies, of course, and others.

All of these initiatives were designed to help the librarian do his or her job better, by travel, by observation, by formal study, and, above all, by a break in the bureaucratic lockstep, an opportunity to think, perhaps even creatively. But Fred Cole is a subtle kind of person, and he has slipped in along the way all sorts of little devices to improve the lot of librarians as well as their skills. From the beginning, the fellowship program has required that a recipient be able to get a leave of absence with pay. The president of the applicant's institution receives a letter from President Cole telling him of the honor that has come to his institution through the selection of one of his librarians and asking for assurance that the leave will be granted. It is my impression that leaves have been worked out almost without exception, even in institutions where librarians have not previously been eligible for leave. A useful precedent has been created. The Library Service Enhancement Program not only gives an imaginative staff member a year's release from routine to work with the collaboration of the Director on better ways of integrating the library with the educational program, it also requires planning with the teaching faculty. One would think that any librarian in his right mind would work with the faculty, but a surprising number of applicants seem to learn this principle of academic life for the first time because of the not-so-subtle pressures of applying for the program. Finally, to fill in for the project librarian during the year, a new library school graduate must be appointed, thus creating a few new jobs in a time of widespread unemployment.

I have repeated these details, probably already familiar to all of you, simply as a reminder that these programs are rather subtle. They are doing two or three things at once, and their structure reveals a deep knowledge of what goes on in libraries, or what ought to go on. One would think that such a program was the result of quite a lot of committee discussion among librarians. Well, I know the secret history of this particular one, for I was there. There was no committee, at least not until selection and implementation began. There were no labor pains. The project simply sprang, fully formed and armed, from the mind of Fred Cole. One morning he walked out of his office and said, what would you think of a program like this? And there it all was, in detail.

In another major area of CLR activity, this sort of immaculate conception will not work, of course. What may turn out in the long run to have been the most important Council function is its role in helping bring about a rational, coherent system of bibliographic control for this country. Here the process is one involving advanced technical judgment, encouraging and stimulating the most promising lines of development, combined with constant pressure through quiet diplomacy, to mold these divergent and often competing systems into the elements of an effective network. Here the agents of Dr. Cole and the Council have been the staff group of computer specialists headed by the remarkable Larry Livingston. A Committee on Bibliographic Control led by Herman Fussler has quietly sketched the long-range goals, while, in his pragmatic way, Larry, with an eye on the ultimate goals, has set in motion a series of attacks on the technical, organizational, and human problems that seem to be within reach.

In my view, a great deal more has been accomplished than is immediately apparent. Only a couple of years ago it seemed already too late to make any sense out of the variety of uncoordinated activities. We shall not have, nor do I think we should have, a monolithic organization of bibliographic control in this country. But we are now on the way toward compatible groupings of authoritative data bases accessible through all libraries, with a potential variety of bibliographic products which should reduce still further the costs of local access to texts. I say this because now the principal elements of these future systems are in constructive communication -- The Library of Congress, the existing and emerging netowrks, the indexing and abstracting community, even the foundations -- these pieces of the mosaic are not yet cemented into place, but they are sorting themselves out and discovering that, after a few odd corners have been smoothed off, they can fit.

It seems to me that the principal agent of this remarkable change has been the Council on Library Resources. Incidentally, by CLR in this context I do not mean the Board, even though it is made up of a number of informed and eminent people. The role of the Board has been to murmur encouragement from the sidelines. Very seldom are there shouts. The real work of imagination and reconciliation has been done by Fred Cole and the central staff.

The new Vice President and incoming President of the Council, our ARL colleague, Jim Haas, has been deeply involved in precisely that aspect of the work of CLR looking toward national bibliographic control. Because of this invovlement and his special talents in planning and management of library automation, we shall not need a transition team to bring in the new administration. He will place his own stamp on the style of CLR, as each of his predecessors has done, and he will find, within the bold tradition established by them, new and effective ways of continuing to get at the heart of library problems.

There has been nothing quite like the Council on Library Resources in the history of the world, the world of libraries at least. As Dick Dougherty wrote in his "Happy Birthday, CLR" editorial, the library profession would have been far poorer had it not been for the contribution of the Council. A cynic could reply, "Sure, it would have been precisely $29 million poorer," for that is the 20-year total of Ford grants. But that is not what the editorial was saying. The contribution has involved a great deal more than cash. It strikes me that, above all else, the factor that has made CLR unique is the ability of its two completely different but wonderfully effective Presidents, Verner Clapp and Fred Cole. Their long shadows certainly touch every facet of this organization.

It pleases me also to think that at least a little credit for the beginning of the whole glorious enterprise belongs to that devine elixir, Old Heaven Hill.

## BUSINESS MEETING

### Opening Remarks

PRESIDENT LATHEM: The first thing I should like to do is to convey thanks to Ray Frantz for arranging and coordinating the program of last night and this morning. I am not sure that all of you realize it is the responsibility of the Vice-President-and-President-Elect to arrange both the October and May meetings that call for organization in the period of his incumbency as Vice President. So, the person standing where I am standing this afternoon has had absolutely nothing to do with the arrangements for the program. The credit, therefore, devolves upon Ray, for what was a stimulating and very worthwhile program.

* * * *

### Election of Board Members

PRESIDENT LATHEM: The first substantive item on the agenda is the election of new members for the Board of Directors. I would remind you that at the San Diego meeting there was instituted a Bylaw change, under which the Nominating Committee is looked to make the same number of nominations as there are vacancies on the Board. (Originally I think this was the case, but for some years we have put up five candidates for three vacancies. We have now, in effect, reverted to what was, if I understand correctly from Bill Dix, the originial practice.) There is, of course, provision for nominations from the floor.

To lead us into this item of agenda, I call on the Chairman of the Nominating Committee to make his formal report to the membership.

VICE PRESIDENT FRANTZ: Mr. President, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, whose other two members are Bill Axford and Bill Budington, I am pleased to place in nomination the following three names for the three vacancies now existing on the Board of Directors:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mrs. Richard Dougherty | University of California, Berkeley |
| Mr. Frank Grisham | Joint University Libraries |
| Mr. Jay Lucker | Massachusetts Inst. of Technology |

PRESIDENT LATHEM: Are there nominations from the floor?

MR. HAMLIN (Temple): Mr. Chairman, I hope it will not upset the Association to make an additional nomination. I am very much aware of a very pleasant and welcome invasion from the north of our sister -- or should I say, our brother -- institutions in Canada. And I am very much aware that we are no longer just a gentlemen's club. So, I would like to place in nomination the name of Marianne Scott, Director of Libraries at McGill University.

[At this point, Mr. Lathem appointed Messrs. Bryant and McDonald to serve as tellers. Each member was allowed to vote for no more than three candidates. After a short interval, Mr. Lathem announced the results of the election.]

PRESIDENT LATHEM: With gratitude to all four nominees who stood for election as candidates for the Board of Directors, I should like to announce the outcome of the balloting. The tellers have reported a total of 80 ballots cast, the top three candidates being Mr. Dougherty, Mr. Grisham, and Mr. Lucker.

* * * *

Publication of Thirteen Colonial Americana

PRESIDENT LATHEM: At this point I should like to make an announcement. Members of the Association will, I think, recall that a year ago in marking the nation's Bicentennial, this Association published, under a grant from the Power Foundation of Ann Arbor, Michigan, a volume called 76 United Statesiana, a collection celebrating American works of scholarship relating to America during the two hundred years of the nation's existence.

This past summer the notion evolved that it would be appropriate, in our two-hundred-and-first year of independence, if there were some special acknowledgement given to the Colonial heritage of the United States. The Commonwealth Fund of New York became enthusiastic about this idea and came forward, very generously, with a handsome grant to cover total costs of the project. Consequently, we have gone forward, with the approval of the Board of Directors, with projecting a successor volume, if you will, to 76 United Statesiana.

Advanced copies of the book have been brought for this meeting, and I am holding one of them in my hand now. The title page bears the title, Thirteen Colonial Americana, and then, beneath that, the subtitle "A selection of publications issued in the British Provinces of North America during the first half-century of the Colonial era" (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1977).

There is a very brief introductory note which I can also read you in toto. It says: "The works featured herein have been chosen to represent something of the nature and variety of products of the American press during the years 1727 through 1776 -- as the thirteen Provinces moved toward the severing of their Colonial ties and a declaration of their political independence. One item has been chosen for each Colony. Arrangement is chronological by date of publication."

I do not propose going all the way through the book, but I will read to you just the next display leaf, which is headed with the rather nice 18th-Century term "Prefatory Subscription." The "Prefatory Subscription" says: "Our country having marked its Bicentennial and now being entered upon its third century, we, the undersigned, on behalf of those States which translated themselves from colonies of Great Britain into the thirteen originating United

States of America, warmly join in this tribute to the Colonial heritage from which publishing emerged and has developed within the American republic." Then follow the signatures of all thirteen Governors of the original states.

The scheme of the book follows quite precisely the arrangement of the earlier volume, 76 United Statesiana. There is (for each state, in this instance) a volume represented by a reproduction of its title page and then, facing that, the beginning of a three-page statement about the book. Each of the 13 items featured in the volume has been written about by a director of an ARL library, with the exception of the Delaware item, since we have no ARL representative from the State of Delaware. I hope you will be pleased by it.

* * * *

## Special Report: The Library of Congress

PRESIDENT LATHEM: From time to time, we have arranged to have the privilege of special reports at the Business Meeting. This afternoon we are very much gratified to have with us Joseph Howard, the Director of Processing at the Library of Congress, who will make a special report to us.

MR. HOWARD (DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS): Very briefly, I would like to report on three things. I would like to mention and talk about AACR II, automating non-Roman-alphabet languages, and what we are doing about freezing our catalogues.

I think all of us have been concerned about AACR II, and we will continue to be concerned until the next millenium. But the status since what was probably your last progress report is this: In August of '77, the Joint Steering Committee of AACR II met for its final deliberations on the content of AACR II. Several major decisions were made in that meeting, and a list of the major changes was issued and published in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, September 2nd, 1977. Rather than read these to you, I would just say that the LCIB outline represents rather well the major content of that meeting. I feel very gratified that some good decisions were made at that meeting.

What next? In the Library of Congress, we are now helping to collocate the decisions that were made last August with the decisions that had been made before. We are just trying to put things together so that, in November and December of this year, Paul Winkler, one of the joint editors, may begin his final review, not for any changes in major aspects, but to see that everything fits, that all the grammar is right, and that, from one chapter to the other, we do not change tenses and so forth. After that is completed in December, the printer's copy is to go to ALA in January of 1978. We expect publication toward the end of 1978. Of course, all of you authors know that it is difficult to know how long the printer will deal with it, but, if it is any guideline, the last edition of AACR took seven months. So, it will be toward the end of 1978 before it is published.

I think there is one other thing that I should reiterate, and this is nothing new, unless you have not had a chance to read the Library of Congress Information Bulletin: the timing that LC plans to adopt in the usage of AACR II. We met last November with representatives from the British Library, the National Library of Canada, and the National Library of Australia, and we have worked out a timetable with them saying that we will adopt AACR II in January of 1980. In essence, we will start using it before January 1980, but you will not see any results of the change until the January issues of our catalogues, NUC, and so forth.

There were several reasons for waiting a little over a year to adopt the new edition. One, it allows us to coordinate the change with our publications. This was strongly recommended by the Canadians and British, and the Library itself was interested in making sure that, say, in January of a certain year you could say that AACR II will be what you see from there on. It is very difficult to change publication schedules in the middle of the year. We also wanted to adopt AACR II at the same time that we plan to adopt Dewey 19. Dewey 19 will be available in the spring of 1979. We need time to train and prepare our staff, as you will need time for training and preparation of your staff. There are certain things it will be necessary to do to the MARC formats, and that will take some time to get through the appropriate committee in ALA.

In the second edition, as in previous editions, there are alternative rules. There are times when you can say, "Do this or this." We feel it is very important that we have time to talk this over nationally and internationally so that we can announce what LC and the research libraries in the U.S. are doing. The New York Public Library has very kindly given us its first draft of preferences, and we are looking at it. We will also be making our preferences known so that we will have time to talk about them before we start initiating AACR II. Beginning AACR II in 1980 also means that we will be able to start without superimposition for the second edition, and we want to coordinate that with the closing of our catalogues. That is very briefly the status of AACR II.

Next is the romanization problem. We want to talk about the non-Roman alphabets, and we would like advice from you. This is the first time that we have broached this, but we need to get something moving soon.

The deadline for putting Cyrillic-alphabet bibliographic records into machine-readable form is set for Fiscal 1979. I should be candid and say that we will meet this deadline if everything goes like clockwork, but, if everything does not go like clockwork, that date may have to be revised. Being the positive people we are, we expect that deadline to be met. We do know that the technology is not yet advanced enough for us to put the other non-Roman alphabets -- Malayalam, Telugu, Hindi, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and all the other multitudes of non-Roman alphabets -- into machine-readable form by 1980. So, we have announced that this will not be done until 1981 or later. Of course, even this schedule depends on the technology and our progress between now and then. We have done a lot of study and we have found that some companies are indeed working very hard on this. But they have not met our

needs yet, so we will continue to work on the problem between now and then. In any case, we know there is going to be a delay in getting our bibliographic records for non-Roman-alphabet materials into machine-readable form. Therefore, we at the Library of Congress would like to give some thought to a pilot project to test the feasibility of handling non-Roman records in romanized form. You are perhaps aware that, in the MARC Serials Distribution Service, all serials now are romanized completely. You may also be aware that we are putting these romanized records into machine-readable form. We are also printing cards in the vernacular. We have had absolutely no derogatory comments on the romanization of the records, but we have not yet fully tested whether we could romanize other materials. This is the point of our pilot project.

To make this all clearer, perhaps I could review for you what we do now on our catalogue cards. On the card you see here, the first line is romanized. That is the author. The second line is the title romanized. Then you go into the script, the vernacular. The first line of this is the title put into the vernacular. It is a repetition of the second line, but the second line is romanized, and the third line is in the script. After the space-slash-space comes the author statement. I cannot read it either, but I assure you that it is the author. There again, the two elements are duplicated, printed once in romanization and once in vernacular. The rest of the vernacular gives publisher, place, and date.

Now, what we are talking about is putting this whole card in romanized form only, which means that we would not duplicate the author and title in the vernacular. We would also romanize the publisher, place, and date, if necessary. We have considerable evidence that vernacular records in romanized form are very valuable and very useful. Our premise is that, in addition to the MARC serials, where we produce cards in two ways -- one in romanized form and one in non-Roman -- we would like to go one step further and romanize all of our records (though I am going to qualify that in a minute by language). We would like to try romanizing all of our records and not continue the expensive duplication represented by the vernacular cards. We would like to try that on a project basis to see if indeed certain romanized records could be valuable.

The area we think would be most fertile for trying this out would be South Asian languages. We feel these languages offer very little problem because they are a one-to-one relationship and so forth. It is not like Chinese and Japanese. We catalogue in over 15 languages using the devanagari script. And, by the way, the Indian languages also use the Arabic script. So this would give us a chance to try an Arabic language as well as a devanagari-based language. One thing that may give us a little headway on this is that the Indian National Bibliography romanizes all of its records. We catalogue around four to five thousand titles a year in these languages. We are not yet ready to say that we want to do this totally, becuase we have some problems we have to look into. For instance, do we have the funding to be able to input these records? We also want to check out the format recognition programs. Can the format recognition programs be adapted to handle the romanized form? And even if we can do it, do we have the time and energy to do it?

The reason I have come before you with this is that we would like to have input from you. We will soon be publishing what I am discussing, and we hope to see what it would do to your libraries if we tried a say, six- or nine-month project of romanizing all South Indian vernacular languages. Such a program would have lots of advantages, and it has some disadvantages. One of the things it would allow us to do is to start automating the complete National Union Catalog earlier. But, as you are perhaps aware, there are some people who feel that that is less than a perfect record. We do not have time for discussion today, but, if you are involved with these languages, would you please go back and write us and let us know what you think. We do not want to do it if it is going to play havoc with your libraries. However, we would like to get tests from you to see whether it would work.

Now, very briefly, I would like to say something about the freezing of the catalogues. Lucia Rather, the Assistant Director for Cataloguing, and her assistant, Bob Hyatt, have written a short article on the freezing of the catalogues which will be published in next week's LCIB. Keep your eyes open for that. This statement says that LC does intend to close its catalogues in 1980. It intends to abandon superimposition in 1980. It intends to adopt the AACR. In other words, there are lots of things happening in 1980, in addition to our moving into the new building.

There are lots of questions about closing the catalog which remain unanswered. We will be appealing for your help in identifying problems that we perhaps have not identified, as well as suggesting solutions. Inside the Library of Congress we are appointing committees to address certain of these problems, and you will be hearing more from us about those later. I think there will be about ten committees addressing this problem. We also plan to have an open hearing at ALA Midwinter sponsored by the Reference and Adult Services Division, Catalog Use Committee, on Tuesday, January 24th from 2:00 to 4:00. We ask that you and your interested staff members please attend, becuase this will not only concern how we will do it, but how we should do it.

I think my time is about up. I want to say one other thing. William Welsh mentioned something about centers of excellence, and we certainly will be giving some thought to that. In this vein, I am pleased to say that we now have a contract with Helen Schmerer at the University of Chicago to work out the beginning draft -- a draft, remember -- for bibliographic and machine conventions for cooperative cataloguing on line. Let me just repeat that, in case I said it badly. The CONSER Manuals are agreements that we have with other libraries and that other libraries have with us about conventions that each one will follow, so that we will have a quality data base. We are now trying to do that same thing for monographs and name authorities. You will be hearing more about that from us later, but, at least we hope to have a draft within a year to start talking to people about.

* * * *

## Report of the Executive Director

MR. LORENZ: Since we last met on that other coast, three thousand miles away in San Diego, I believe that our most important collaborative achievement has been the congressional appropriation of $5 million for Title II-C of the Higher Education Act. Again, I want to thank you all for your splendid cooperation. Your communications with your members of Congress all had a very positive effect, because I cannot stress to much what an achievement it was to bring something that was "zeroed out" in both the executive budget and the congressional budget up to the level of $5 million. Of all the hundreds of items in the OE budget, I believe this was the only one that came from zero up to a positive figure.

At the same time, I believe this is really just the beginning of the challenge to us. I think it is now up to all of us to do the best possible planning for the use of these funds -- planning which will result in projects that both improve resources for research collections and improve access to research collections. This small beginning provides us with the opportunity to build a professional base and a political base for what we hope will develop from this legislation and subsequent appropriations. Let us not forget that $20 million is authorized for this program in fiscal 1979. So, we have a mark to shoot for and to achieve.

Right now we are waiting for the 1978 appropriation to become final. I never realized that all of us would become involved in an abortion problem, but it is the abortion issue that is holding up final action on the legislation. This is scheduled to be resolved by the two houses of Congress soon after the end of this month, and, hopefully, the appropriation then will become final. I should say that the $5 million is not an item in contention. Both houses have already agreed upon the II-C money. As soon as the abortion issue is resolved, the bill should go to the President for signature, and the funds will then become available.

In the meantime, we have been in communication with the Office of Education staff who are working on regulations and application forms for the program. I think we are very fortunate to have with us this afternoon Dick Hays and some members of his staff from the Office of Education to bring us up to date on just where things stand in the Office.

MR. HAYS: Let me first introduce two of my colleagues who are joining me today. The first is Paul Janaske, who directs the Division of Library Programs. Our other colleague is Frank Stevens, who has been doing a tour de force in getting the regulations put together on Title II-C.

I think John has provided an excellent overview of the intent, some of the challenges, and the excitement that we all face in getting a new program put together. Paul Janaske has direct responsibility for doing all this and I would like Paul to brief you all on things that are quite relevant. You have seen, in the past months, something called the "Proposed Rules". In the future -- hopefully soon -- you will see something called "Final Regulations", which will indicate how this program is to be operated.

MR. JANASKE: If I remember correctly, it is two years ago that we began to discuss the rules and regulations and how we could effectively administer this program. However, it has only been very recently -- let me see if I can get you the precise dates here, November the 22nd of 1976 -- that the notice of "Intent for Proposed Rule-making" was published. Then, finally, the "Proposed Rules" were published on the 6th of June in 1977. The comment period for the Proposed Rules ended on July 21st of 1977, and, if we are really lucky, since the Secretary signed off on the regulations on October 20th, we may have the regulations published by December of this year.

Now, interestingly enough, when the Proposed Rules were issued and you were invited to respond to them, we felt we had very good response. Fifty-one comments came in in response to the "Notice of Intent" and 38 comments came in on the "Notice of Proposed Rule-making." For those of you who do not remember some of the content of these proposed rules, there was an interesting statement in the original legislation which said that there should be a reasonable geographical distribution of these grants. Now, there are a number of ways that one can satisfy this requirement in the law. It would be fairly simple to say that every state shall receive a grant, but we can all understand that this is not the most reasonable way to do it. We think we have come up with a better way of incorporating an area of concern into the distribution of the grants. It is not the regional basis that some of you may be familiar with from various offices in the Federal Government that have regional offices. But it is, as we prefer to call it, an area distribution, a lumping of states in a given area.

This problem caused perhaps the greatest number of comments on the proposed rule-making. People said they did not like the fact that New York stood alone and California stood alone and that Puerto Rico was in still another region and somebody else was in another region and "Why wasn't Massachusetts on the same basis as New York and California?", and so on into the night. I am not here to argue these points, and I do not think any of us want to reopen the issue at this stage of the game, other than to say that, as a result of the comments, we did break out another area: the Great Lakes. We had quite a concentration of what we consider to be major research libraries in that area, so there are now two regions there. Now, let me emphasize that we are not talking about simply distributing these grants on the basis of some regional or area consideration. The main consideration for the awarding of grants under this program will be on quality and quality alone.

Again, when you go back to the rules which will ultimately be published, you will find a lot of discourse concerning the fact that, once the point scores for distributing grants have been made, we discover that Area One or Area Five or Area Six has not received any grants, because the scores did not fall within the range for funding. We do have the option of going back to award bonus points that will hopefully bring some library in that region up to the point at which it might be funded. We are still not compelled to fund a library in a region, just because no one in the region has achieved a certain score range. It is still a qualitative consideration, and I hope that none of you will have any misconceptions about it.

The other point that interested us was the chitchat about this requirement of awarding points for an institution or organization that had a doctoral degree program established with it. Some people believed this was not a reasonable consideration. After great deliberation and some consultation with this organization and the American Library Association, we decided to retain that consideration within the framework of awarding scores to applications.

Several people were also interested and concerned about what seemed to them an inequity in the total number of points for two issues. For the criteria measuring the significance of a major research library, we were assigning 60 points, whereas we were assigning only 40 points for the criteria measuring the nature of the project. A number of people thought 40 points was rather low and asked whether we should not be giving more points for the precise nature of the project itself. We agreed to this and have added an additional 10 points. The point score now adds up to 110, as opposed to 100, as it had originally. I think you will see that the two issues I have identified here are the only major changes, except for some typographical errors and omissions in the Proposed Rules.

The other point I would like to emphasize is that this program cannot be easily compared to the Title II-A program, where we receive applications, evaluate them to see if they are valid, divide the number of dollars we have by the number of valid applications we have, and arrive at the amount that each successful applicant gets. We do not propose to do that with II-C. The proposals will be judged on merit, and the essential consideration in determining merit will be, "What contribution can they make to sharing resources?" I would urge you to consider projects which will contribute to resource sharing, hopefully on a national scale.

Let me go back and mention the good work that Frank Stevens has done in getting these rules and regulations together. I think Frank proposes to linger at the meeting a little longer than Mr. Hays and I can, and I am sure he will be glad to answer any specific questions you may have. Please feel free to get in touch with us.

By the way, the deadline date is April the 11th. As soon as we can get our hands on some printed application forms, we will distribute them accordingly. The application forms will not be very complicated. As I remember correctly, they consist of no more than four pages. The first page will identify your organization and ask for street addresses, phone numbers, and that kind of thing. The following pages will be budget identification matters. Of course, the real guts of your application will be a narrative proposal. You might consider getting to work on that before the packages arrive at your door. The application would not be unlike those that you might have filled out for a research project.

I think that is as much as I can add at this stage of the game.

MR. LORENZ: I think that this time we have before the April 11 deadline might very advantageously be used to do as much joint planning as possible in the development of applications. By that I mean several institutions planning

together for the use of the resources available under this Title. I think this would strengthen the application. Even though the application might come in from an individual institution -- as I think is intended -- the application can certainly indicate that it has been jointly planned among several institutions for the best possible use of funds. The use of funds may also include contracting with some of these other agencies.

MR. BOSS (Princeton): May we assume that libraries in different areas may undertake cooperative ventures without complicating the review process and the point-counting system which involves an "area allocation" of funds?

MR. LORENZ: I believe so. The applying institution would be responsible for the funds received but, under contract, could share those funds with other insititutions for a joint project purpose.

MR. ROGERS (Yale): May one institution propose more than one project?

MR. LORENZ: I think that probably would not be wise, at least in this first go-round, with the funds as limited as they are. I would guess that only one project would be funded.

MR. ROGERS: Is that an official answer?

MR. HAYS: An institution may submit as many proposals as it likes, but I think John's advice is probably good. At this time, it would pay to devote your efforts to one quality proposal, rather than trying a shotgun approach.

MR. LORENZ: We have a feeling that there may be some sympathy within the Office of Education -- and I hope within the Advisory Committee that will review applications -- for limiting the total number of applications approved to 50-100, rather than the maximum of 150, since funding is so limited this first year. I hope we would agree professionally that this would be wise in this first year. I think this would also indicate the desirability of pooling objectives in this first go-round. Overall, though, the proposals should be highly qualified, and they should result in projects that show some favorable impact on both collections and the users of those collections.

We also understand that, within the Office of Education, and, specifically, with the Commissioner of Education, Ernie Boyer, there is some real understanding of the importance of the development of a national library system or network. The sooner we can come to agreement on the outline of what would be a truly useful and constructive national library system or network, the sooner we might get support to develop that kind of system.

So, I think there are some very good signs and portents, but the challenge is now up to you, in effect, to pick up the ball and do the best possible job that you can with the resources available.

I might point out that this Congress also extended the Library Services and Construction Act for five more years, with added emphasis being given in the extension to the Interlibrary Cooperation Title and, in fact, authorizing

funding under that Title for '79 to '82 at a $20 million level. Now, those funds go to state library agencies, but I see no reason why there should not be some joint planning, perhaps in the use of both Title II-C and Interlibrary Cooperation funding. This may result in some better projects and better use of resources. We will keep you informed as best we can of new developments, new guidelines, and any other information that will give you guidance in the applications that you do develop.

Now, moving on to copyright, another important topic and, again, one that is difficult to speak about briefly and also nonprofanely: I am sure all of you have been reading the growing literature on the application of the new law and on the guidelines and regulations. I will not try to summarize what is in the literature. However, I would like to point up the excellent article that Dick De Gennaro wrote on the subject. I subscribe to the courage and the attention to both rights and responsibilities of librarians in that article. I do think that Dick struck a very good note which should be heeded.

To bring you up to date on some things that have happened recently, it was just last Friday that the six national library associations, under CNLA auspices, appeared jointly before the Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works and presented a joint statement to CONTU. In summary, we underlined the following points:

-- That copyright exists for the benefit of the public and not just for copyright owners

-- That libraries exist to serve users and are agents of users

-- That the library associations have been doing their best to inform themselves and their members of their rights and responsibilities under the new legislation, the guidelines, and the regulations

-- That libraries are preparing to operate within the law and to help evaluate the results over the next five years

-- That, generally, additional guidelines and definitions are not needed, and

-- That the associations have recently issued information on proposed copyright clearance procedures for photocopying.

A copy of this was sent to all members of ARL.

We emphasized that the King Research report indicates that library photocopying of copyrighted materials is a small fraction of the total photocopying that is being done, and we indicated that the library associations support CONTU's concern on applications of new technology to copyright principles. In summary, we feel that the present law is a reasonable compromise arrived at after a long period of debate and compromise and that libraries and library associations are ready to work with and evaluate the results over the next five years.

Another new development is the development of a pamphlet of questions and answers on copyright, prepared by the ALA in conjunction with the NEA, on the teaching use of copyrighted materials. This pamphlet will soon be available, and copies will be sent to you.

I understand that at the luncheon meeting today of the Interlibrary Loan Committee, the Committee discussed some of the problems of reserve materials under the new legislation. Jay Lucker has given me this recommendation, which came out of the Committee:

> The Committee recommends that ARL, through the headquarters staff, work with ALA in the development of a statement on copyright implications for reserve materials and interlibrary borrowing, for distribution of such statement as soon as possible.

ARL Directors are encouraged to communicate specific questions to the ARL Office, which will review them. I would suggest a deadline of November 15 for such submission to the ARL Office. We shall cooperate with ALA and shall try to get information back to you which is as helpful as possible in answering those questions before January 1, 1978.

We have had some informal discussions with the ARL General Counsel. On this question of reserves, which we understand is critical for you, he indicated that if a teacher or a professor brings a quantity of materials into the library to put on reserve, that is a legitimate action. The librarian has no responsibility to go behind the professor's action and would not be responsible for the manner in which the professor or the teacher acquired these materials. Now, that was his opinion, but, if you have questions in this area, bring them forward to us.

He also advised us as much as possible to stay away from the strictly legal advice area. That we would be getting the Association into a problem of coming between the librarian and the university counsel on such matters. But, again, we feel we are walking a very narrow tightrope in all of this. We want to do as much as we can to be as helpful as we can, and we will try to meet the problem as best we can in communicating with you. I expect we are going to be learning a good deal more about copyright and the associated problems after January 1. I hope Barbara Ringer is right when she says she does not believe the mood is to litigate, and I hope the prescription in the law that "anything which happens in these areas of library photocopying will be evaluated over a five-year peroid" will be honored. In other words, I hope we will have five years in which to gain experience and evaluate.

I also hope that the business about the copyright legislation being the Lawyers' Full Employment Act of 1976 is only a bad joke and that such will not come to pass. I expect there will be threats, but I hope that the threats will not be carried out.

I tried to imply at the CONTU hearing that the basic problem was economic. Thus, what libraries have to spend in litigation and on lawyers' fees might very well come out of funds available for purchasing materials.

Are there any questions that you would like to surface at this time on copyright?

MS. PERRY (Rochester): When a university has different schools, such as a medical school and a music school, that are on different campuses and are budgeted separately but have one director, is it one system or is it two or three?

MR. LORENZ: That is one of the questions that has not been answered. I have my answer, but I do not know if it is the answer. My answer is that any institution or agency which is under one director who makes determinations regarding budgeting and appointments is one institution. As soon as you go beyond that and you have another relatively independent director who has those responsibilities, I would say that probably is another institution.

MR. WELSH: And John will defend you.

MS. PERRY: Then I do not have to worry after the First.

MR. McDONALD (CONNECTICUT): As you know, John, there is a well-known trap in this. If you are one institution when you are borrowing, you have to be one institution when you are lending. So you had better stop and think about which way you want it.

A MEMBER: What about the AAP Clearinghouse? Is that really established, and will it be functional by January?

MR. LORENZ: At the hearing it was indicated that it was now incorporated and will be operative by January 1, 1978. A contractor has been selected. It will operate out of Schenectady, New York -- I was going to say you had better move it to Troy because we cannot spell Schenectady. Its Director will be David Waite, whom many of us remember from another business. Representatives at the CONTU meeting indicated that the overhead charge would be about 25 cents above the cost that would be indicated on the article that was to be copied. These same people thought the Clearinghouse would be a viable organization based on that overhead charge.

A MEMBER: Is there any further word about NTIS's plans?

MR. LORENZ: It was said that NTIS will be cooperating with the Copyright Clearance Center in certain respects. But that was not spelled out. ISI was also represented at the hearing, and Garfield gave a presentation indicating that he also would be cooperating in some way with the CCC. So, there does seem to be some joining of forces and some communication at that level.

We were accused by the authors and publishers of already indicating a lack of cooperation with the CCC. We referred to the fact that, in the publication that we are distributing, we point out the availability of CCC and NTIS for purposes that may be found to be legitimate and proper by libraries, purposes which would not be covered by the rights under 108 and 107.

MR. TREZZA (NCLIS): Just a bit of information. The King Research report, as you keep calling it, which is Patterns of Library Photocopying, is getting ready to go to GPO by Monday, and we hope to have copies for distribution in early December. We are doing two things with it. We are not only printing the full report, we are also going to print a separate summary, which is about 13 or 14 pages. We will make the summary available not only in single copies but in modest quantities, and GPO will also have it. The basic report, which is about 250 pages, will also be available in single copies from us and in larger quantities from GPO.

There is a third piece which will come out later, another volume of 200 or 300 pages which will include all of the data that was collected for the study. Obviously, that will be done more for the purposes of historical research and in a very modest quanity, and we trust most people will not want it. But, those who want the research can have it.

MR. LORENZ: Just a few other items: Some of you will be interested in the communication we have been having on the accreditatioin of law schools by the American Bar Association.

There have been some determinations made in this regard, and I am pleased to report that, in accordance with a letter which was sent from ARL, we understand that the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation has reminded the American Bar Association that, based on the Council's own provisions, they are to avoid interference with the legitimate administration of the colleges and universities in which law shcools are located.

Another item of information: Work is continuing by the Joint ARL/ACRL Committee developing university library standards. While these standards are still in draft form, the Committee felt it would be desirable, as was done in the development of the college library standards, that a review meeting be held with representatives of higher education organizations. A small grant from the Council on Library Resources became available for such a meeting, and the meeting is now scheduled for November 29 in Washington. We hope there to get the comments and suggestions of the representatives of higher education associations.

Now, it has been some time since we have reported to you on the Center for Chinese Research Materials, and I think this is an appropriate time to give you an update, because, in May 1978, the ARL Center for Chinese Research Materials will celebrate, believe it or not, its tenth anniversary. We believe this is a significant achievement for an organization that relies fully on foundation and governmental support in order to fulfill its mandate, that is, to serve scholars and librarians in the field of Chinese studies by providing bibliographic services and, at a reasonable cost, reprints of materials significant for research. Over the past nine-and-a-half years, the ARL Chinese Center has proven its value again and again to various foundations in gaining their financial support. We are appreciative to these foundations.

Despite the reduced purchasing power of many research libraries, the East Asian libraries in our universities have continued to avail themselves of

the services offered by the ARL Chinese Center at an encouraging rate. Sales of our materials during the period under review have totaled more than $146,000. In September of '76 the ARL Center received, for the third time, a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities under its gift and matching grant program, which will enable the Center to continue its programs at least until February 1979. Of the total grant amount of $400,000, $200,000 was provided by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, to which we are also indebted.

The past year has been a very busy one for the Center's Director, P.K. Yu, who I am pleased to say is with us for this meeting. In constant pursuit of heretofore unavailable valuable Chinese research materials, he has traveled through seven countries and visited many East Asian collections in this country, combing their catalogues and collections for scholarly gems. In June, 1977, P.K. went to the Far East for a series of visits to Seoul, Taipei, Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Kyoto. He acquired materials for reproduction, discussed the Center's activities and services with scholars and librarians, and investigated typesetting and printing facilities there. The fruitful results of these visits will become evident, I am sure, in the coming months.

At the invitation of the Institute of Scientific Information for the Social Sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, P.K. went to Moscow in September for a busy two weeks. During this time, he visited oriental libraries and centers of research in both Moscow and Leningrad. Both scholars and librarians in these institutions were eager to learn more about the ARL Chinese Center and expressed a desire for closer cooperation. The visit gave P.K. an opportunity to get acquainted with the Chinese collections in the two cities and to negotiate an agreement with the Institute which provides for an active exchange from this point on of research materials.

On his return from the Soviet Union, P.K. made stopovers in both Copenhagen and London, and, in addition to promoting sales, as he always does, he discussed various projects of mutual interest and benefit with the Acting Director of the Scandinavian Institute for Asian Studies in Copenhagen and also secured the cooperation of the Librarian of the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London in a future project which will entail the reproduction on microfilm of a large number of Chinese local newspapers.

In summary, I would say our Center has truly been a scholarly success story. 1977 was a particularly fruitful year and we expect that, based on the record of achievement, and with your support, this Center will continue to prosper.

We also have a particular interest in how the National Endowment for the Humanities can be helpful to all of us, and I am very glad that Margaret Child is here at this conference because Margaret usually is able to give us some new information which is interesting and useful.

MS. CHILD (NEH): The question a number of you have asked me today has been, "What interest does our new Chairman, Mr. Joseph Duffy, have in libraries and their problems?" Unfortunately, I do not have an answer to this

question. Mr. Duffy was sworn in just a week ago Tuesday, and, although he has been in and out of the Endowment on an official basis for about a month, he is being a very wise man and is listening rather than making any statements at this point. So, I do not really have any feeling for his position on libraries. I would, however, urge any of you who have an opportunity to meet Mr. Duffy on one occasion or another to do what you can to heighten his consciousness in this area. I think we all have an interest in making sure he knows what your particular problems are. I do from a programmatic view, of course.

I did think you might be interested in an updated report on the Challenge Grant Program, which I spoke to you about last May. We have now had two cycles of that program, one that went to Council in May and one in August. In the first cycle, 125 awards were made. A total of $30.9 million was offered over a period that will actually run for three years (These are three-year grants). In the second cycle, we made another 106 awards totaling $38 million, again over a three-year period.

As a result of this burst of expenditure on our part, we managed, in those first two cycles, to offer out our total Fiscal '77 appropriation of $9 million and also our total 1978 appropriation, the current fiscal year, of $15 million.

As a result, the applications which are coming in against the next deadline, which is December 15, will be funded out of Fiscal 1979. Your letters of intent are due by the fist of November if you intend to apply against the December 15 deadline. The 1979 budget, of course, will not go to Congress until the spring. We do not know how much Congress will approrpriate, but the pattern of escalation predicted for this program indicates that the amount will again be substantially greater than this year's appropriation. We also expect that there will be new funding available for the cycle that will be coming up.

Of the total amount we have spent so far, I have tried to get some figures on how much we have spent specifically on grants to libraries. Internally, at the Endowment, those applications dealing exclusively with either university research libraries which are members of the Association of Research Libraries or special research libraries, many of them members of the Independent Research Libraries Association, have been handled by my division, the Division of Research Grants. My division has made a total of 14 grants specifically to libraries in these first two cycles. However, there were a great many institutions which chose to incorporate their library requests within a larger proposal from the university as a whole. I do not have any figures on the amount of money that went to libraries through this approach. I would estimate that there were probably about two dozen other awards that were buried in larger proposals which went through our Division of Education, which dealt very specifically with the kind of libraries that are members of this Association.

As to my regular program, the Research Collections Program, our funding for the current fiscal year is exactly the same as it was last year. The eloquent prose that I prepared for our zero-based budgeting proposals apparently

did not convince people to give me three times as much money, which is what I felt I could spend. This, of course, means an absolute decline, because of inflation. Fortunately, for reasons that I am still trying to figure out, the number of applications is also down, although the quality seems to be very high. I think we will manage to find some way to get rid of the money this fiscal year.

There is, out on the table in the lobby, an article in the most recent issue of the Endowment's newsletter, Humanities, describing the program. Particularly for those of you who may be new library directors, you might be interested in picking that up and finding out what it is that we are doing in this area at the Endowment.

MR. LORENZ: Another topic that we spent a lot of time on at San Diego is the national periodicals system and the National Periodicals Center. I will ask Al Trezza if he would give us a quick update on what is happening in that area.

MR. TREZZA (NCLIS): You recall, at the San Diego meeting, we were just pulling together the final report of our Task Force on a National Periodicals Center for presentation to the Commission for action. The Commission met in September and adopted the report, which has now been published. We sent copies to all ARL libraries as well as many others. At that time we also issued a press release indicating the seven or eight actions taken by the Commission. Essentially, the Commission supported the recommendations of the Report, including the recommendation that the Library of Congress be given the opportunity to serve as the National Periodicals Center. You must remember, in talking about this, that there are two terms. There is a national periodicals system, which is the total system consisting of three levels, and there is the National Periodicals Center, which will be a dedicated center, possibly at the Library of Congress.

The next phase involves preparing the design study for setting up the Center, and a foundation grant has been sought for that purpose. An announcement should be made within a month or so about that. The Library of Congress and the Council on Library Resources will be cooperating on the design portion of the study. Two advisory committees will be set up, one by the National Commission, to act as an advisory committee to the system. The Commission sought recommendations for the membership of this committee from ARL, ALA, ASIS, SLA, COSLA and -- who have I left out? -- the appropriate groups, the private sector. The advisory committee announcement will be made, again, within the next few weeks. I can tell you that we expect to have three representatives from institutions which are ARL members. We should remember that the National Periodicals Center really involves more than just the United States. As Guy Sylvestre reminds me, it should really be thought of as a service to North America. The Library of Congress will appoint the second advisory committee to the Center, and, hopefully, there will be a little bit of overlap between the two groups for continuity and liaison.

If all goes well, we should be moving forward with the program, though it is hard to estimate when the Center will be operational. I think the study

will take at least nine months after it has been announced, and we are not quite sure about the effects of some other issues that have yet to be discussed. One issue which will have to be resolved before the Center actually operates is the matter of copyright. We are going to have to discuss some definitions, I am afraid, with the National Center. You will hear more about that later. It has to do with that statement about systematic copying that has got to be resolved before the Center opens its doors. Otherwise, we will never get any kind of agreement with the publishers on it.

MR. LORENZ: Finally, I would just like to note a continually growing interest on the Washington scene in research libraries, and I would give, as just one example, the growing interest of the Association of American Universities. This Association, has decided to strengthen its program considerably, both in resources and staff. It has a new President, Tom Bartlett, formerly of Colgate, who indicates that one priority his organization will be stressing is research libraries. As has been indicated to you in a memo, AAU has already appointed a committee on research libraries headed by Sheldon Hackney of Tulane. I hope you will pay note to the other members of that committee, and, for those of you who are at institutions from which these committee members come, I think it would be highly desirable to make a contact with them. Alexander Heard of Vanderbilt is another member of that committee. At the same time, the Association of Graduate Schools has appointed a committee on research libraries, headed by Jerry Pelikan of Yale, which has some other distinguished members as well. I have indicated to Bartlett our great desire to help and cooperate with these two committees in any possible way.

## Report of the Task Force on ARL Statistics

MR. TALBOT (MASSACHUSETTS): Statistics is a dry subject, so I will try to make this as quick and painless as possible. The members of the Task Force, in addition to myself, have been Donald Koepp of Arizona State and Kendon Stubbs of the University of Virginia. The charge to the Task Force was to work with the ARL Office staff in reviewing ARL's salary and statistics surveys, with a view toward recommending improvements and refinements in the data collection. Secondly, we were asked to explore the desirability and feasibility of updating the Baumol study, Economics of Academic Libraries. We approached our charge in a very conservative way. We did not want to recommend anything that was not both useful and cost-beneficial -- at least we did not want to do anything cost-detrimental. If we asked anything new, we wanted to be sure that you agreed it was worth collecting.

In the end, we made 12 recommendations to the Board, and the most important of them are these: We recommended that, in addition to the median salary, the overall average salary should be presented from each institution. We also recommended establishing displays which would show the salaries for men and women, minorities, ranks, and regions. That is what will be generated from the reports that most of you have sent in so far. To guard against the possibility of revealing information about a particular salary, we recommended that we should not publish specific data when there were four or fewer individuals in a particular category. In connection with the basic ARL statistics, we

felt there should be no major changes in the kinds of statistical information traditionally gathered by ARL at this time. We had hoped to align our survey with the survey conducted by NCES, but conditions at NCES seem to be somewhat unsettled at the moment. We thought it unwise to make a recommendation in that category for the time being.

The survey that goes out this next year, will include a supplemental questionnaire. The most important question on it will seek to determine whether the membership wishes to add a new question to the survey asking for the expenditures for current serials. We would like to differentiate within the expenditure category between serials and other types of materials.

Two supplemental reports will be issued. One is the Library Resource Index, which is a simple mechanical computation using a device invented by Alan Carter in 1964 and published in a book that he wrote on assessment of graduate education. A number of people find this device useful. So, we will compute the index and send it to you. We have also worked with the Baumol formulas and have modified a series of six regression formulas from which we will generate a series of tables. The format of the report is a facsimile of a computer printout, in which a comparison group will be displayed: the names of the institutions on the left, the value of the variable being predicted (for example, professional staff), the actual estimate, the difference between the two, and then, to the left or right of the normalized regression line a plot showing where your institution stands, so you can tell at a glance where your institution stands amid the pyramid group. Now, if it turns out that these reports are useful to you, they will continue to be produced; if not, they will not be.

Finally, we made a recommendation that the ARL Office should investigate the possibility of getting funding to do an update of the Baumol study, looking at different variables to see whether there might be a possibility of generating better results.

## Report of the Committee on Access to Rare Books and Manuscripts

MR. DUNLAP (IOWA): Fortunately, for those of us on this Committee, we would never describe our field as a dry one. I think we really have the frosting on the cake.

We had two meetings this year, one at Cornell and one in Chicago. All members attended the two meetings of the Committee, and, in addition, Sue Frankie attended each of them. The Committee members are Bill Cagle, the newly-appointed Head Librarian at the Lilly Library, Herbert Finch of Cornell University, John Finzi of the Library of Congress, and myself.

At the Cornell meeting in April, we talked quite a bit about what we could do to help with the plans for the development of the short title catalogue of 18th Century books published in English. Since then, we have had further conversations with Tom Adams, who is at the John Carter Brown Library and is the American coordinator for this project. He tells me that the

British Library is now involved in encoding its 18th Century books, and this, I find, is a word that means "to catalogue", but it is not supposed to frighten people. A New York pilot project will soon be launched to get more facts and figures, so we can have a better estimate of the cost of underwriting the entire project. Thirdly, there is now an attempt, or there soon will be an attempt, to come up with a definitive list of 18th Century American and Canadian publications. The American Antiquarian Society is heading this project. From the standpoint of this constituency, it will be at least three years before the STC will be interested in what they call enrichments, which, in our terminology, means "when they would like to have further precise information about our holdings".

At San Diego, I told you about a project that had been undertaken at Cornell to cull their shelf list for 18th Century books. I spoke about how they had gone through their shelf list of 1400 trays in about 700 hours and had thereby identified the 18th Century books that were still on the open shelves. These were then moved to the rare book room. We were interested in how this project might help with supplying information to STC, but we were also interested in how it might help with the security problem. It gets a lot of valuable books off the shelves, of course. I told you at San Diego that I hoped the University of Iowa Libraries would try this project and see how it came out. We did it over the last summer. We culled about 800,000 cards in our shelf list, and it took about 800 hours. But the hours that we devoted to it were spent by people on regular duty at the reference desk when things were a little slack in the summer. Out of this, we identified more than 800 STC books which we will transfer to our special collections department, to be joined with about 2700 others that were already there. I have reported this to T.R. Adams, and we have established a chronological file of these entries. He thinks he may find this file of some use to his own group in planning.

Our Committee seemed to believe that other libraries had done this, but we had no precise information. We would formally encourage ARL libraries to undertake this, wherever it is convenient to do so. If you want any advisory assistance, or if you get the job done, if you would simply write me a letter, I will share it with the Committee and Mr. Adams and see how we can get ourselves ready to help with the STC enrichment. Moreover, this will help us do a better job of knowing what we have on our shelves and protecting our STC books.

Also at the Cornell meeting, after we had talked about security and how to protect our STC books, we talked about the desirability of meeting with some of the folks in the Society of American Archivists, which had received a grant from NEH in the amount of about $100,000 to do three things:

(1) To prepare a manual on security for archives and manuscripts,

(2) To put together and introduce a consultant service to libraries, and

(3) To publish a register of lost and stolen materials.

We went forward with this and it went very well. We proposed to the SAA offices in Chicago that we have a joint meeting with them, and they encouraged us to come along.

SAA convened the members of its security committee with some other people who were interested in this area at a two-day meeting in Chicago, October 13 and 14. I think all of us who sat through those sessions thought they were very provocative and very thoughtful. We are not quite sure how we are going to implement this, but Sue Frankie did mention that we might have a mini-workshop in advance of the annual meeting in Nashville and see if we could pass some of the discussion on.

I should tell you that SAA would welcome wider utilization of its consultant service. It has a list of consultants on security for rare books and manuscripts, and, if you pick up the tab for transportation and lodging, SAA will pay the consultant's fee. So, here is a chance to get in on a bargain situation, and you will find the consultants uncover a great many things that perhaps you had not thought about. For instance, my library was burglarized last Thanksgiving, and we were robbed of $75,000 worth of materials. It is surprising that most of that came back to us because of word that was placed in journals that circulate among art dealers. This was some photographic material. But break-ins are quite extraordinary. Most of the losses come through filching on the part of readers or staff members. A consultant can make you aware of this and suggest procedures that keep this from happening too often. Also, SAA would welcome participation by ARL libraries in their Register of Missing Items.

Our colleagues at SAA at first rather timidly broached the subject of having a joint committee of ARL and SAA, consisting of two members from each organization plus the executive director of each, which would meet twice a year to talk about common problems. Before the meeting was over, SAA came out quite strongly with this. Our own Committee at Chicago thought we should do this, that only good could come of it. We recommended this very controversial suggestion to your Board yesterday, and they adopted it. I hope it will bring only good things.

## Special Announcement

MR. McDONALD (CONNECTICUT): I asked for a moment of your time to make a couple of announcements. The first has to do with a future meeting of the ARL to be held in Boston in the spring of 1979. By that time, God and Governor Grasso willing, the University of Connecticut should be in a major new library building. You may have noticed that the University of Texas recently announced that it had just completed the third largest university library building in the country, at something slightly over 400,000 square feet. I guess maybe Chicago and Indiana top that. Well, Connecticut is about to complete the fourth largest in that case, at slightly under 400,000 square feet. Boston is surprisingly close to Storrs, and I have in mind making arrangements whereby members of the Association, who can spare the time and would be interested, could be brought to darkest Storrs to see our new building. We may even try to dedicate it about that time. I simply want to implant this idea now so that you can build an extra day into your schedules for the Spring of 1979. More on this later if I survive to that moment.

The other thing I wish to say is on behalf of the ACRL National Conference, to be held in Boston about a year from now -- November 8-11, to be precise. ACRL will hold a famous first conference at which it will meet apart from the rest of the ALA. There will be no committee meetings; it will be strictly a program session, at which there will be invited and contributed papers. Some of you, I am sure, have noticed the call for papers that has been published in College and Research Library News and elsewhere in the library press. I am here simply to remind all of you of this call for papers, in case any of you have one up your sleeve. I do think some of the people here who are serving on important committees and doing important work might be ready to report something at the ACRL Conference. Perhaps more important, if you could needle your staffs a little bit to think about contributing a paper for this conference, it would serve the purposes of the conference and, more important perhaps, the purposes of the staff members. Nowadays, we do expect people to publish, if possible. It is part of the process of securing recognition toward promotion and so forth. So, I think it is quite natural to put this opportunity before them.

Julie Virgo has kindly supplied me with a memo on the dates for submission. Notice of intent to submit needs to be in by November 30th, 1977, submission of the completed manuscript by February 28th, 1978, and notification of acceptance after a refereeing process would be forthcoming by May 31, 1978. There may be some flexibility in this schedule, but there it is, and I have done my duty for the program committee of the 1978 ACRL Boston Conference.

PRESIDENT LATHEM: Thank you, John. I, for one, would view with great pleasure the prospect of a visit to "darkest Storrs", as you call it.

## Report of the Office of University Library Management Studies

Since the last membership meeting in San Diego, our Office has concentrated on operating the Collection Analysis Project, the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, and the Training Program. I will briefly review some of these activities and urge you to contact the Office if you would like additional information.

You heard a great deal about the Collection Analysis Project this morning, so I will say no more about that. The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) has been very active since our last report. The increasing pace of this activity is largely the result of efforts by Maxine Sitts, whom you may already have met. While we have had a full-time SPEC Coordinator previously, Maxine's experience in publications has made a big difference in the day-to-day operation, as well as the quality, of the SPEC program. We have issued five Flyers and Kits since May: "Intergration of Non-Print Media", "Determining Indirect Cost Rates in Research Libraries", "Preservation of Library Materials", "The Allocation of Materials Funds", and "Theft Detection and Prevention in Academic Libraries". Our new Kits have an improved format with a table of contents, and over half of the earlier Kits (13) have been edited, revised, and updated. A management supplement on

library use instruction and an annotated bibliography on library management also have been issued. Several information requests by members have been answered through searches of SPEC files, and a list of the ARL libraries which use audiovisual materials for point-of-use instruction was produced in response to requests at the San Diego meeting.

Plans for the future include surveys and Flyers on the issues of skills training and the operation of automated circulation, acquisition, and cataloging systems. In this connection, I want to highlight Office appreciation for member willingness to contribute responses to these surveys. The recent survey on theft detection and prevention in libraries secured 90 responses out of the 105 members, and this was accomplished without a follow-up or reminder.

Deanna Marcum heads the OMS Training Program. Deanna is also new to the Office, but, unlike the SPEC Coordinator, she fills a new position that we were able to establish because of the Mellon grant for the Collection Analysis Project. In addition to working on CAP, Deanna has divided her time between operating the training program and developing plans for new training activities. The training program has four parts. First, it provides useful management films. These are screened and carefully selected for their pertinence to library training programs, and we design discussion and instructional materials to accompany them. To date, we have previewed 20 to 30 films, selecting seven. The most recent film is "Leadership: Style or Circumstance". Twenty-eight ARL members participate in the program, and we have calls from eight to ten users per month. A list of the films is available from Deanna.

Secondly, our training program operates three-and-one-half-day Management Skills Institutes for library supervisors and executives. These focus on such activities as problem definition and analysis, interpersonal behavior, group dynamics, leadership, and decision-making, by relating contemporary theories and concepts to library operational concerns. We have conducted four institutes so far, with the next scheduled for November 15-18 at Columbia, Maryland.

A third aspect of our training program will get its first test on November 3 and 4 at SUNY Binghamton. This is a two-day special-focus workshop, operated on demand for member libraries. These workshops focus on such specific topics as basic supervisory skills, communication skills, time management skills, or group problem solving skills, with the key being the joint definition of the skill area by the OMS staff and the library. SUNY Binghamton approached us with a particular need: helping their supervisory staff deal more successfully with the day-to-day operational concerns, and we designed a workshop to meet this need. Currently, another joint venture is being discussed with Columbia University. In this instance Deanna outlined two training programs and allowed Columbia to choose between the two options. Special-focus workshops, jointly designed to meet individual library training needs, are available to any member library willing to share the direct costs of operation.

The training program's fourth concern is the development of new training programs and the securing the funds to support these programs. Several ideas

have been examined and two proposals have been advanced. Essentially, we are looking at developing in-house training materials for use in a research library setting.

In addition to SPEC and the Training Program, the Office continues to operate developmental studies such as MRAP. The Office has worked with Johns Hopkins University in completing MRAP and in implementing an organizational design study, and it is now working with the University of Oklahoma, which began the studies in August. The Office is also providing assistance to a non-ARL library -- The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration -- in applying the program, and they are paying ARL for the direct costs.

Another developmental effort I have reported to you previously is the Academic Library Development Program. This is a self-study technique for small and mid-size libraries, which covers a review of services, collections, management, facilities, and technology. This project is midway through a test of the revised manual at three libraries: Carnegie Mellon University, Drew University, and the University of Wisconsin at Parkridge. The Council on Library Resources sponsors this project and compensates ARL for time spent on the effort.

These three projects: CAP, MRAP, and ALDP, currently involve the Office in direct consultation with eight different library studies. As you might expect, this consumes most of the attention of Jeff Gardner and myself.

The OMS Advisory Committee, made up of Frank Grisham, Bill Studer, Page Ackerman, and Lou Martin, will meet in December to review OMS priorities for this past year and to assist us in determining our priorities for 1978. In addition, they will aid us in planning future funding for the Office.

## Report of the President

PRESIDENT LATHEM: The final item on the agenda is the "President's Report", which is scheduled to take ten minutes. I will reassure you that, in the first place, there is no "report". And I am not going to take ten minutes.

I do, however, want to express, for myself and for my institution, deep gratitude for the privilege of my having been a member of this Association's Board of Directors and, also, for the honor of my having served you as your President this past year.

I suppose that Annapolis is an appropriate place for official endings, and I do not here refer to Governor Marvin Mandel. My mind goes back, and I would remind you of it, to the fact that (I think it was in December of 1783) George Washington formally laid down his sword as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army only a very few hundred yards from the spot where we are meeting this afternoon. I am not George Washington and I do not have any sword to lay down. As a matter of fact, there is no symbol of the Presidency of this Association. For years I have been hearing on President say to another, something to the effect "I am now going to pass the gavel to you."

But there has never been any gavel. North-country New Hampshiremen are not very good at figurative thinking, and tend to be rather suspicious of this sort of fiction or fantasy. Accordingly, I have undertaken to provide a gavel, so that I do not have to speak in terms of figurativeness. I take it out of a bag that my wife and mother have provided for it. (Removing gavel from bag). It has on it the symbol, the monogram, of the Association, "ARL," with a little bit of writing very faintly around the band of the gavel, which identifies it as "The President's Gavel."

There is another inscription that I should like to make reference to. As a preface to that, I will say that I had yesterday, at my final meeting as President with your Board of Directors, an opportunity to thank the Board for its kindness and tolerance over the past year, and I had opportunity to pay tribute to two members of the Board who are leaving it this year, Russell Shank and Richard Boss. But I quite deliberately excluded from my remarks yesterday at the Board meeting any reference to the fact that the Board is losing, and this Association is losing at this meeting, the presence of a very great lady who has been with us for some years and who served us as a member of the Board, as Vice President, as President, and now is terminating her service as Past-president. She has this summer retired from the Directorship at Rutgers and will no longer be meetng, in the future, with ARL.

There tends to build up -- as I think none of you would, who have not been "through the chairs," so to speak, realize -- a very close relationship among the members of your Executive Committee, your three officers: the Vice-President-and-President-Elect, the President, and the Past President. I have very much cherished this relationship for myself, with Dick De Gennaro and Virginia Whitney and Ray Frantz. And that special reltionshup takes on, with Virginia, and aspect that I sould rather like to commemorate. (One of my few distinctions as your President, I might add, has been that I was the first President of this organization who was able -- at least with seemliness -- to kiss his predecessor upon succeeding her on the platform.)

This gavel bespeaks my admiration, my regard, and my very special affection for Virginia Whitney. The inscription reads: "Presented October 27th, 1977, in honor of Virginia P. Whitney, president 1975-1976."

Mr. Prsident-Elect who was and Mr. President who now is, may I give this gavel to you.

(President Lathem presents gavel tc vice President Frantz.)

PRESIDENT FRANTZ: I shall be brief, but no one can assume this office without realizing how much he owes to others, and I especially want to pay tribute to our immediate Past President for the skillful and productive way in which he has presided over and guided the affairs of this Association this last year. I also want to give my sincere thanks to the headquarters staff who, believe me, had a great deal to do with the preparation of this program today.

There will be a meeting of the Board of Directors tonight in Room 530 (to impress upon you how zealous the Board is) at eight o'clock, which will include the three new members of the Board. We will look forwared to seeing you then.

If there is no more business to come before us at this time, I declare the Ninety-first Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries adjourned.

APPENDIX - A

# ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT

DECEMBER 1977

*1527*
*New Hampshire*
*Avenue, N. W.*
*Washington, D. C. 20036*
*(202) 232-8656*

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report reviews the major activities of the ARL's Office of University Library Management Studies during 1977. The Office's work with member libraries underscored the challenges that continue to command the attention of research library directors. Some of these challenges, described in last year's annual report, are reviewed in the next section of this report.

During 1977 the Office provided member libraries with a range of resources and services encompassing programs of Research and Development, Information Collection and Dissemination, and Training. The highlights of these efforts included:

- Two libraries completed the Management Review and Analysis Program, bringing the number of MRAP participants to a total of 24 libraries. A complete list of MRAP study reports is available from the Office.

- The Office assisted the Council on Library Resources in testing the Academic Library Development Program (an assisted, self-study technique aimed at small and mid-sized academic libraries) at three demonstration libraries.

- The Office designed a Collection Analysis Procedure for research libraries, prepared a Manual, and initiated three test library studies.

- The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) conducted five surveys of member library practices, prepared nine SPEC Flyers and Kits, revised and reformatted a number of earlier Kits, responded to 4,087 requests for information, maintained 164 SPEC subscriptions for non-member libraries, and distributed over 10,000 copies of SPEC Flyers to ARL library staff members.

- The Office prepared and distributed three major publications on the topics of library use instruction, audiovisual materials for point-of-use library instruction, and library management issues in the 1970's.

- The Office conducted two Management Skills Institutes involving 73 library staff members.

- The Management Training Film Program acquired a film on the issue of managerial leadership and continued to make available resources for in-house library training programs.

- The Office staff participated in four regional workshops and designed a series of special focus workshops to be operated at member libraries on issues specified by the library.

## II. RESEARCH LIBRARY MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

In examining the challenges facing research library management during recent years, the need for planned change emerges as an over-riding concern. But the initiation and facilitation of change in library organizations is restricted by external factors including shrinking purchasing power, federal and state legislative constraints, collective bargaining arrangements, and the ambiguity inherent in the state of rapidly advancing technology. Other constraints are internal factors such as staff apathy, large complex bibliographical structures and research collections, and traditional ways of operation. Given the rapid unplanned changes occurring in the library's environment, a critical management task is to provide leadership that better equips the library to understand and deal with these developments.

While ARL library directors have felt pressures and participated in the ongoing changes in their universities, there is some residual concern about the library's degree of influence in these events. University administrators to whom the directors report seem to change frequently, causing repetitive education efforts. In some instances, the library function can become obscured through organizational shifts or through the specialized and limited judgements of administrative assistants, faculty pressure groups, or legal advisors. In other cases, administrators with little knowledge of library operations and needs are pressuring for increased library accountability, which calls for directors to formulate and justify programs to conserve resources and focus them on priority needs.

Furthermore, ARL directors are confronting fundamental decisions that will greatly influence future library performance. Such decisions include closing the catalog, reallocating the library's materials budget, making full use of interinstitutional cooperation, or installing new automated circulation systems. The technical feasibility and economic justification of these kinds of changes are frequently straightforward; the dilemma is in implementing the action. These changes do not happen automatically--someone or something has to make them happen. At the same time, every significant management decision is visible and requires sensitivity to the political and organizational realities of the university. Because of this combination of external and internal pressures, many library managers are starting to see themselves as change agents rather than as library administrators in the traditional sense.

As change agents, directors are less directly involved with day-to-day planning and controlling and are spending more time representing library interests to external groups, particularly university top management. In addition they are delegating internal tasks, decision, and responsibilities much more than in the past. Their emphasis is now on monitoring, coordinating,

and facilitating library operations and the central concern is tuning the library into the changes and developments which occur in the environment. This has led to increased efforts to develop staff-wide awareness of these environmental pressures, needs, and developments so that fundamental library decisions and programs can both influence and respond to them.

In last year's annual report, the Office described five contemporary challenges facing library executives concerned with the process of planned change and library development: coping with financial pressures, improving collections management, influencing the external environment, clarifying library goals and priorities, and improving the management of human resources. During 1977, certain patterns of development emerged as ARL directors faced these challenges.

While budgets have remained generally stable, pressures for increased accountability have required libraries to do a better job of conserving resources and focusing them on priority needs. The majority of ARL libraries are finding it extremely difficult to maintain historical spending patterns. Many institutions have initiated major fund-raising programs to secure support from private donors and foundations, while others are investigating trends in library development in order to reconcile institutional aspirations with available resources. Library management also is pressing for improved data on performance and productivity that can help make resource allocation decisions and that can project the financial effects on the library of potential university policy changes. In the aggregate, financial pressures are forcing major changes in library operations, including expanded use of technology and collaborative arrangements, and strengthening of internal management processes.

Interest in better management of research library collections grew during 1977, according to an Office survey on current collections practices. Most members have undertaken or intend to undertake major efforts to strengthen their collection development programs. Under the a grant from the Mellon Foundation, the Office is designing a procedure for analyzing a research library's collection development program, and a pilot test of this procedure was started at three libraries (Massachusetts Institute of Technlogy, Arizona State University, and the University of California at Berkeley). Cornell University, Case Western Reserve University, and the University of Rochester have received grants to study and strengthen collections, and Berkeley and Stanford University are working together on a project to enhance mutual access to their collections. Within all of these projects, there is considerable interest in evaluating the effectiveness of collections. Meetings of collection development officers from large research libraries have focused on the issue of evaluation, and the Office currently is preparing a SPEC Kit documenting collection assessment projects and techniques at several ARL libraries.

Negotiating the relationship of the library to its environ-

ment continues to demand the attention of library directors. A key issue is the ability of library performance to change with conditions. This requires processes for gathering information on changes in the environment and applying it to library goals and organization. The Management Review and Analysis Program and the Collection Analysis Project are two processes research libraries are using to accomplish these goals. Some libraries have elected to rely chiefly on the role of the director within the university to interact effectively with the environment. Others have involved a spectrum of library staff in various university councils. The California State University system has established a coordinating officer to collect data on libraries and relate them to state-wide institutional needs. Overall, library directors are increasingly aware of the need for processes they can use in understanding, adapting to, and influencing their environment.

The relationship between the university's and the library's goals also is critical to successful operation of a research library. In part, this is a matter of ensuring goal congruence --that is, library managers must determine what the university needs and be willing to support and formulate library programs accordingly. The recognition that poorly defined or overly broad objectives can prevent an organization from focusing its resources on priority needs has led to efforts at clarifying and formalizing library goals and objectives.

In the area of management of human resources, the need to develop and maintain technically skilled and organizationally committed staff has led management to pay increased attention to training efforts, staff development programs, and innovative rewards systems. Several ARL libraries have staff development officers, and many more operate active staff development committees. These individuals and groups have moved beyond the traditional emphasis on such activities as administering travel funds to the more important tasks of identifying organizational needs and designing or contracting for training programs to develop needed skills among existing staff. These programs range from training in supervisory communications skills, performance appraisal, and goal setting to specific skills training for support staff. In addition, an increasing number of libraries have moved from rigidly hierarchical rewards systems toward classification schemes which recognize and reward technical and professional expertise and performance. This is allowing staff to develop and advance in areas other than administration.

In each of these areas, and in the role of the library director generally, the process of change itself is taking on as much importance as the issues. The ways in which library directors introduce new directions and implement change will be the commanding theme of the next few years. While library directors are willing to change, the processes, technology, and skills available for initiating and management change are limited. Expertise in dealing with libraries as large complex social systems is lacking and in many instances staffs seem to know more about resisting and preventing change than in engaging and facilitating development. Planned library change requires effort, imagination, leadership, and resources.

## III. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES OF THE ARL OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES (OMS) IN 1977

Since its inception in 1970 the Office's programs have emphasized the investigation of managerial concerns of research libraries and the development of resources and services that assist these large organizations to improve performance. The core programs of the Office are: applied research and development, information collection and dissemination, organizational training, and consultation. The OMS program activities during 1977 are noted below.

### A. THE OFFICE PROGRAM OF APPLIED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

This program includes the identification of library issues requiring study, the development of means of dealing with library problems, and the design of management processes that will lead to overall library performance improvement. Current projects operated as developmental activities include: the Management Review and Analysis Program, the Academic Library Development Program, and the Collection Analysis Project.

#### 1. The Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP)

The OMS continues to make available the resources needed for this assisted self-study of library management functions. During 1977, the OMS worked with the application of the program at the Johns Hopkins University Library, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency Library (NOAA), the University of Oklahoma Libraries, and the University of Southern Illinois at Edwardsville Library. The first two libraries completed the study report and began implementing the results of the study during the year. The latter two libraries began the study in the Fall, and the Office will provide resources and assistance for the completion of the program in the next year.

Completed MRAP study reports from 24 previous participants are available from the OMS.

An assessment of the impact of MRAP at participating libraries was completed under a separately funded project at the Pennsylvania State University Libraries. The study was funded by the Council on Library Resources and directed by Edward Johnson and Stuart Mann. The study determined that the overall effect of MRAP was worthwhile and successful as perceived by the library directors, managers and staff. The full report will be published shortly by the authors.

2. The Academic Library Development Program (ALDP)

The Academic Library Development Program applies the OMS's experience in operating the Management Review and Analysis Program to the design and operation of a focused self-study procedure for small and mid-sized academic libraries. The ALDP is sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, Inc., and ARL has agreed to release a limited amount of the time of the OMS Director to assist in its development. Dr. Grady Morein has been retained by the Council to direct the ALDP. During the current year, three studies were initiated to test and further develop the ALDP operating manual. The libraries at Carnegie-Mellon University, Drew University, and the University of Wisconsin/Parkside received grants from the Council to complete this work.

3. The Collection Analysis Project (CAP)

The Collection Analysis Project (CAP) operates under a $110,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The purpose of this project is to design and test a study procedure that individual research libraries can use to examine and document their collection policies, program, and operating practices. During the year the OMS staff drafted a study manual which provides the framework for a six to nine month self-study covering a general review of environmental factors influencing the development of collections as well as detailed examination of internal practices of materials funds allocation, organization, staffing, materials selection, collection assessment, resource sharing, and preservation.

Pilot studies were initiated during the year to test and refine the CAP manual. The libraries at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Arizona State University, and the University of California at Berkeley agreed to work with the OMS in the pilot testing of the program. These libraries were selected because they represent the wide range of member library characteristics including: an emerging and rapidly growing research collection, a decentralized and technically oriented collection, and an established, comprehensive research collection.

The pilot study phase of the OMS Collection Analysis Project has reached the half-way point at the M.I.T. and Arizona State University Libraries. The study teams at these libraries have completed their Interim Reports, which discuss environmental factors influencing collection development, the historical development of their collections, and collection objectives. Copies of these reports are available from the OMS. Task forces at these institutions are now investigating their libraries' collection assessment procedures, preservation programs, resource-sharing techniques, materials' budget allocation procedures, and the organization and staffing of collection activities. Final reports are expected in March 1978.

The University of California at Berkeley, the third pilot study site, initiated its project in November and is now proceeding through the first phase with its study team. The interim report from this study is scheduled for completion by March 1978.

It is expected that the results of these pilot studies will be evaluated by the Collection Analysis Program Advisory Committee and that the Office will consider options for making the study procedure available to members on a continuing basis.

## B. THE OFFICE PROGRAM OF INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION

The purpose of OMS activities in this area is to secure and make available information on research library practices which might stimulate improvement in research library operation and management. The program operates an information clearinghouse and issues publications.

### 1. The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC)

SPEC is an information clearinghouse for ARL member libraries which provides a cooperative approach to sharing ideas and experiences in a formal, systematic fashion. Over the past four years, SPEC has developed a number of approaches to dissemination of documentation from member libraries, its own analyses of these materials, and other information services. Because the expanding information in the SPEC files is useful to other types of libraries as well, there are now 161 non-ARL subscribers to SPEC publications and services. The key accomplishments of SPEC during 1977 in each of its major endeavors are noted below.

The initial step in operating the clearinghouse is securing up-to-date information on library operations. To do this the Office designs surveys and seeks help from liaisons in each ARL library to secure relevant documentation. The following surveys were carried out the SPEC Office during 1977:

Collection Analysis (nine parts--in conjunction with Collection Analysis Project)

Book Theft Detection Systems and Prevention Procedures

Technical Skills Training

Integration of Nonprint Media (by phone)

Determining Indirect Costs (by phone)

In addition, the SPEC coordinator collaborated with Olin Library at Cornell in analyzing its survey of remote storage activities.

The SPEC Kits and Flyers are based on the results of these surveys and include data and documentation from member libraries that illustrate effective current practices. Nine Kits and Flyers were issued in 1977:

Allocation of Resources in Academic Libraries (No. 31) summarizes the results of a recent survey of ARL members, and discusses strategies for coping with reduced budgets, organizational procedures for resource allocation, impact of current allocation decisions, and future needs and trends. The Kit contains 10 documents totaling 100 pages.

Preparation and Presentation of the Library Budget (No. 32) reports that most of the 68 ARL members who responded to a survey use more than one budget format, and that three-quarters utilize an administrative council, department heads, or a representative committee as consultants during budget preparation. The Kit contains 15 documents (150 pages) that include samples of budget process outlines, budget instructions, committee materials, budget presentation and support data, and budget plans.

Integration of Nonprint Media (No. 33) is the result of a phone survey of 27 ARL member libraries. The Flyer notes that the nature of the institution appears to be a major determinant in the development of nonprint media programs, with the strongest collections occurring at universities whose missions are directed more toward instruction than research. The Kit contains 17 documents (108 pages) describing media programs and services, acquisition and processing policies, and budget request and planning activities.

Determining Indirect Cost Rates in Research Libraries (No. 34) points out that universities and libraries are searching for accounting procedures that will allow them to recover equitably the indirect costs incurred during federally-sponsored research. Because federal regulations on indirect costs frequently change, because various agencies interpret existing regulations differently, and because salient parties do not accept the reliability of use studies (which document the costs to libraries associated with federally-sponsored research), most efforts to determine library indirect cost rates have been complicated, inconclusive, and confusing. The Kit contains samples of library cost studies and user surveys, accounting worksheets, and other documents that reflect current methods for determining indirect costs.

Preservation of Library Materials (No. 35) highlights the growing recognition by member libraries of the need for a codified preservation program at the local, regional, and national levels. Poor paper quality, high costs of rebinding and microfilming, and a growing need for better environmental controls all contribute to a situation that requires extensive comprehensive planning. The Kit includes 14 documents from member libraries (85 pages) that provide information on the National Preservation Program, binding specifications, local preservation programs, and planning for binding requirements.

Allocation of Materials Funds in Academic Libraries (No. 36) points out that libraries are questioning traditional materials funds allocation methods and moving toward the ongoing review of collections as they relate to changing university instructional and research programs. The Flyer also discusses criteria for allocation of materials funds, and the allocation decision-making process. The Kit's 16 documents deal with the decision-making process, statistics and criteria, the use of a formula, and general background information.

Theft Detection and Prevention in Academic Libraries (No. 37) reports on ARL members' solutions to the problems of theft and mutilation and presents the results of a survey of the 105 ARL libraries conducted in the summer. The Flyer discusses factors to consider in selecting an electronic security system (ESS), strengths and weaknesses of an ESS, alternative methods of theft prevention, and future trends and issues. The Kit contains materials dealing with planning for an ESS, implementing and evaluating an ESS, user education, and policies and procedures for theft prevention.

Collection Development Policies (No. 38) discusses general survey results including purposes for collection development policies, pros and cons of such policies, policy statements for selected areas, and future trends. The accompanying 109 page Kit contains two library documents on planning, and nine documents illustrating ARL members' collection development policies.

Remote Storage in ARL Libraries (No. 39) provides documentation and discussion concerning remote and compact storage policies, based on a 1977 survey of ARL members conducted by Cornell University's Olin Library. Although national or regional storage and deposit facilities offer some home for retention of selected materials, it appears that, for the most part, individual research and academic libraries have had to develop their own storage facilities. Remote storage usually is considered only part of the solution to the space crunch, in addition to microfilming, increased use of interlibrary loan, and weeding. Accompanying the two page informational SPEC Flyer is a 112 page Kit, which contains preliminary results from the Cornell Survey, sample survey responses, and library documentation on planning and procedures.

Based on user evaluation and staff analysis, OMS is refining and expanding its SPEC materials and services. In addition to publishing new titles, the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center has recently reformatted and updated previous SPEC Kits. To date, SPEC has added a limited amount of updated material to three Kits and has furnished an additional three with extensive new material. It has also added covers and tables of contents to ten previously published Kits. A list of the more extensively revised Kits, as of December 1977, appears below.

| Revisions Made | Kit No. | Kit Title |
|---|---|---|
| Extensive New Material | # 1 | Organization Charts |
| Extensive New Material | # 3 | Personnel Organization |
| Some New Material | # 6 | Friends of the Library |
| Extensive New Material | #17 | Library Instruction |
| Some New Material | #29 | Systems Function |
| Some New Material | #30 | Support Staff |

To increase the usefulness of SPEC files, they were reorganized to be accessible by major subject area, rather than by institution name. This reorganization has resulted in faster and more complete information searches by staff members and by on-site users.

During the year the Center responded to 4,087 requests for information, including 2,773 orders for SPEC Kits and 1,201 orders for other publications; maintained 164 SPEC subscriptions; and maintained SPEC files for use by ARL members, SPEC subscribers, and individuals performing library research. In addition, 2,019 major publications were mailed to member libraries, and 10,000 copies of the SPEC Flyer were distributed to ARL library staff and directors.

2. Major OMS Publications Developed in 1976

In addition to the clearinghouse activities, the Office also develops special publications that are generally derived from the research and development projects. Two continuing publication series are maintained: the ARL Management Supplements, which are state-of-the-art reviews in selected areas, and the OMS Occasional Papers, which present models or improved approaches to important management concerns. During 1977 three major publications were issued:

Library Management in the 1970's: Summary of Issues and Selected Bibliography (16pp.) is a selective guide to library management literature which includes discussions and annotated bibliographies on the following subjects: Management of Human Resources, Administrative Systems and Procedures, Research Development, and Organizational Change.

Library Use Instruction in Academic and Research Libraries (ARL Management Supplement V.5, N.1, September 1977) provides an indepth examination of library instruction programs at a variety of universities across the country. In examining the state-of-the-art, the supplement emphasizes program implementation, administrative issues, cooperative efforts, unmet needs, and current developments and uses of instruction.

ARL Member Libraries Using Audiovisual Materials for Point-of-Use Library Instruction (17pp., September 1977) is a listing created in response to ARL members' interests expressed at the Spring 1977 Association meeting in San Diego. The listing and an appendix of additional information will be updated periodically.

In addition, three articles about SPEC were prepared: for American Libraries (published November 1977), for Information's Organization Profile and for the (LAD) Library Administration Division Newsletter.

## C. THE OFFICE PROGRAM OF ORGANIZATIONAL TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The OMS Training Program fosters more effective library management through the acquisition of required knowledge and skills by library staff. The OMS operates management workshops and institutes, selects and makes available training films, works with individual libraries in operating specified training activities, and designs training programs. The training program conducted the following activities during 1977.

### 1. Management Skills Institutes

The Office operated two Management Skills Institutes during 1977. Each institute aimed at providing an intensive, personal learning event relating to skills needed to improve supervisory and managerial effectiveness. The format of the institutes centered on identifying and specifying individual concerns and then, in a laboratory setting, providing resources that facilitate progress on the resolution of these concerns.

The first institute in 1977 was conducted at Kansas City during August and was attended by 31 librarians. The second institute was held at Columbia, Maryland in November and was attended by 42 librarians. Evaluations of each institute were completed by participants and are available from the Office.

2. Training Project at McGill University Libraries

The McGill Training Project was continued with an organizational needs assessment of the Undergraduate Library on November 29 - 30. The results of this assessment will be reviewed for possible additional organizational development or training needs in early 1978.

3. Training Film Resources Program

The OMS screens and selects training films to make them available to member libraries maintaining in-house training programs. In addition, the Office designs training materials that facilitate the use of these films in libraries. To date seven films have been acquired and the supporting materials prepared. During 1977, 48 films were screened. The film "Leadership: Style or Circumstance" was added to this collection. Based on Fred E. Fiedler's research, the film illustrates the notion that effective leadership is not so much the function of any one management style as it is the result of matching the right style to the right job at the right time. The film is based on documentary footage of two actual administrators, one a relationship-oriented leader and the other a task-oriented leader. The two executives, with entirely different approaches to leadership, are equally effective in their jobs. Fiedler appears in short interviews to explain his theory, called "Situational" or "Contingency" management, and to account for the apparent discrepancy.

This program is available to ARL libraries willing to share film acquisition costs. Thirty libraries have contributed $250 each to participate, and the films have been used in 117 training programs.

4. Workshops

OMS staff regularly operate or participate in one or two-day workshops that are intended either to review OMS program activities or to provide an introduction to management concepts. During 1977, OMS staff participated in:

Princeton, Problem Identification/Problem-Solving Workshop, May 22 - 25.

MRAP Workshop at Ball State University Library, April 1, 1977.

Federal Library Committee, Management Workshop, April 27 - 28.

ALA, Committee of Staff Development Officers in Large Research Libraries, Workshop on Staff Development Needs Assessment, January, 1977.

In addition, a new program of special focus workshops was designed and tested during the year. These special focus workshops are joint efforts between libraries identifying a specific training need and OMS staff designing and operating a training program that meets the limited goals within a two-day period.

The first workshop, a test of this concept, was conducted on November 3 - 4 at the SUNY, Binghamton Library. The workshop was devoted to basic supervisory skills for the library's middle managers.

D. OTHER OFFICE ACTIVITIES

During the year the Office strengthened its staffing and advisory relationships. Ms. Deanna Marcum, former assistant director of libraries at Joint University Libraries, was appointed to the new position of Training Program Coordinator on March 1, 1977. This position was established with funds provided by the Mellon grant, noted earlier, and will be directed toward furthering the Office's training program.

Ms. Maxine Sitts was appointed SPEC Coordinator on March 28, 1977. Ms. Sitts, who replaces Nancy Zeidner, was formerly publications director at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources at Stanford University.

Two new advisory groups to work with Office staff were established during the year. The Collection Analysis Project Advisory Committee was set up to aid in the development of the CAP, and to evaluate the pilot studies. The committee includes Charles Churchwell, Jean Boyer Hamlin, Sheila Dowd, Allan Taylor, Jim Henderson, Richard DeGennaro, and Harry Dell.

The second group, the Office of Management Studies Advisory Committee, provides broad-based guidance and advice in defining programs and plans of the Office. This committee is made up of Page Ackerman, Louis Martin, William Studer, and Frank Grisham.

The staff of the Office extends a special thank you to Dr. Fred Cole, who retired as President of the Council of Library Resources at the end of 1977. His advice, counsel and support have been important factors in the progress of the Office and indeed, his interest in the development of library management has made possible the program accomplishments of the Office.

## IV. OFFICE PRIORITIES FOR 1978

The design and operation of strategies for improving libraries continues as a principle program interest of the Office. Research libraries need a complete set of tools to improve library performance. The Management Review and Analysis Program is one technique concentrating on assisted management self-study available to member libraries, and implementation assistance to past participants will continue to be provided. In 1978 two libraries are participating in MRAP (the University of Oklahoma and the University of Southern Illinois at Edwardsville).

The design of the Collection Analysis Procedure will be a major research and development program priority of the Office in the next year. In 1978 the three CAP pilot tests at Arizona State University, M.I.T. and University of California/Berkeley will be completed and the project's Advisory Committee will evaluate their results. Future options for the use of this program will be considered.

The Academic Library Development Program, a project sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, will secure the continued assistance of OMS staff. This program is completing a series of demonstration studies at Drew University, the University of Wisconsin at Parkside, and Carnegie Mellon University. Following these studies options for future operation of the program will be determined.

In addition to these developmental activities, the Office will expand the current level of activity of our Information Clearinghouse. The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) expects to conduct three to four surveys, issue 10 Kits and Flyers, and publish three major papers. The Center will also develop three resource notebooks under a new grant from the Wilson Foundation. The notebooks will bring together MRAP reports, SPEC documents and other relevant data to form problem-solving tools. The Center will also maintain its individualized question answering, reference, and survey services to members.

In 1978 the Training Program will conduct three Management Skills Institutes (Chicago in May, Washington in July, and Boston in November), provide on-demand special focus workshops, operate a management film program, and coordinate a series of technical workshops for ARL Directors at the May 1978 Membership Meeting. In addition, foundation funding will be sought to support a series of self-administered training modules.

An important priority for 1978 involves the financial support for future Office programs. The Office is in the third year of operating under the current grant from the Council on Library Resources. This grant provides roughly one-third of the OMS budget. Cost recovery activities and other small grants cover about 40% of the budget. The ARL directly supports about 20% of the Office's budget. In the future, this pattern of financial support will be examined to assure continuity of Office programs. The recently established ARL Office of University Library Management Studies Advisory Committee will assist the staff in designing a strategy for meeting future budgetary needs of the Office.

Duane E. Webster
Director

Deanna B. Marcum
Training Program Coordinator

Jeffrey J. Gardner
Management Research
Specialist

Maxine K. Sitts
SPEC Coordinator

(APPENDIX A) - Attachment 1

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES PUBLICATIONS AND RELATED DOCUMENTATION IN 1977

---


Arizona State University Library. Collection Analysis Project Interim Report to the University Librarian and Library Staff, November 17, 1977. 106 pp. Available from Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies.

Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies. ARL Member Libraries Using Audiovisual Materials for Point-of-Use Library Instruction. Washington, D.C.: Author, September 1977. 17 pp.

Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies. Library Management in the 1970's: Summary of Issues and Selected Bibliography. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1977. 16 pp.

Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies. "Library Use Instruction in Academic and Research Libraries." ARL Management Supplement, V.5, N.1. Washington, D.C.: Author, September 1977. 6 pp.

Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies. Management Training Film Program. Training Package for Film "Leadership: Style or Circumstance." Washington, D.C.: Author, 1977. 13 pp.

Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. SPEC Flyers and Kits 31 - 39. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1977.

-- Allocation of Resources, No. 31, March 1977, 101 pp.
-- Preparation and Presentation of the Library Budget, No. 32, April 1977, 150 pp.
-- Integration of Nonprint Media, No. 33, May 1977, 108 pp.

-- Determining Indirect Cost Rates, No. 34, July 1977, 93 pp.
-- Preservation of Library Materials, No. 35, August 1977, 85 pp.
-- The Allocation of Materials Funds, No. 36, September 1977, 97 pp.
-- Theft Detection and Prevention, No. 37, October 1977, 113 pp.
-- Collection Development Policies, No. 38, November 1977, 109 pp.
-- Remote Storage, No. 39, December 1977, 112 pp.

Gardner, Jeffrey. and Duane E. Webster. The Collection Analysis Project -- Operating Manual for an Assisted Self-Study for the Review and Analysis of the Collection Development Function in Academic and Research Libraries. Working Draft. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, June 1977, Unnumbered.

Gardner, Jeffrey J. Issues Encountered in the Collection Analysis Project. Paper delivered at the 91st Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries, October 25, 1977. Unnumbered.

Gardner, Jeffrey J. "Pathfinders, Library." In Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science, V. 21. New York: Marcel Dekker Inc., 1977. pp. 468-473.

Johns Hopkins University. The Milton S. Eisenhower Library MRAP Report September 1976, 131 pp. Made available in 1977 to Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, Washington, D.C.

Morein, P. Grady, and Duane E. Webster. The Academic Library Development Program Working Draft. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources, Inc. August 1977, unnumbered. (Distribution limited to ALDP participants.)

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries. Collection Analysis Project Interim Report, October 21, 1977. 99 pp. Available through Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, Washington, D.C.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Management Review and Analysis Program of the Library and Information Services Division, Environmental Science Information Center, Environmental Data Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Final Report to the Division Chief. November 1977, 69 pp. Available through Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, Washington, D.C.

Sitts, Maxine K. "Academic Libraries Share Their Know-How." In American Libraries. V.8, N.10, November 1977. Chicago: American Library Association. p. 570.

University of California at Los Angeles. Management Review and Analysis Program/UCLA Library, February 1977. 138 pp. Available through Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies.

Webster, Duane E. "Choices Facing Academic Libraries in Allocating Scarce Resources." In Library Budgeting: Critical Challenges for the Future. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The Pierian Press, 1977. pp. 75-88.

Webster, Duane E. A Concept of Collection Analysis and Development. Paper delivered to the 91st Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries, October 25, 1977. Unnumbered.

Webster, Duane E. Improving Library Performance: Quantitative Approaches to Library Planning. Paper delivered at the International Association of Technological University Libraries Conference, Louvain, Belgium, May 15-21, 1977. Unnumbered.

Zeidner, Nancy I. and Duane E. Webster. "Personnel and Employment: Staff Development." In The ALA Yearbook, 1977 Edition. Chicago: American Library Association, 1977, pp. 240-243.

REPORT OF THE INTERLIBRARY LOAN COMMITTEE

Association of Research Libraries

The principal activity of the Committee during 1976-77 was the survey on interlibrary loan charges among the member libraries. The survey was undertakin in response to a concern expressed by a number of directors at the May 1976 meeting that charging for interlibrary loans other than photocopies was becoming increasingly prevalent. A questionnaire was distributed during August of 1976 and the results were tabulated in the Fall of 1976. A written report was submitted to the Board of Direectors and was approved for distribution to the membership in January, 1977.

The result of the survey indicated that only eight libraries were charging fees for interlibrary loans and that the number could not be expected to increase significantly in the immediate future. The Committee's recommendations, based on the findings, was that no further action be taken with regard to standardization of coupons, which had been a concern of the ARL membership.

The Committee has maintained close liaison with the American Library Association's Interlibrary Loan Committee and has been involved in discussions on the revised ILL form and on various implications of the new copyright law on interlibrary loan.

The Committee will be meeting in Annapolis in October, 1977, with the main topic being consideration of what should be done within ARL to advise members on copyright law impact.

The Committee wishes to acknowledge the excellent support and assistance it has received from the Associate Executive Director, Suzanne O. Frankie.

Jay Lucker
Chairman

September 12, 1977

APPENDIX - C

## ANNUAL REPORT OF THE

## ARL COMMITTEE ON ACCESS TO MANUSCRIPTS AND RARE BOOKS

The Committee held two meetings this year: the first on April 22 was held on the campus of Cornell University at Ithaca, and the second on October 13-14 was held at Hull House on the Chicago Circle campus of the University of Illinois. Both were attended by all members of the Committee, William Cagle, Herbert Finch, John Finzi, Sue Frankie representing the ARL office, and Leslie Dunlap, chairman. At the meeting in Ithaca, Don Eddy, Rare Books Librarian at Cornell, attened as a guest.

The group at Ithaca discussed recent public offerings of Winslow Homer prints, some of which presumably were taken from copies of nineteenth century periodicals on the shelves of ARL libraries, and requested the ARL Office to investigate whether appropriate police action could be taken. The Committee had received the review of recent discussions of security for rare books and manuscripts prepared by Robert A. McCown, Manuscripts Librarian at the University of Iowa Libraries, and the decision was reached to arrange, if possible, a joint meeting with the Security Committee of the Society of American Archivists. In addition, considerable time was spent exploring the develpment of the proposed 18th Century short-title catalog. Background material had been furnished by Bob Vosper, UCLA, to the chairman, who pursued the subject in correspondence and telephone conversations with the American coordinator for ESTC, Thomas R. Adams, Librarian of the John Carter Brown Library. The Library at Cornell had prepared a chronological file of its 18th century publications in English, and a summary of how this was done was shared with members of the committee by Don Eddy. The principal points covered at Ithaca were reviewed orally by the Chairman to the ARL Board and to members of the Association at the annual meeting in San Diego on May 5 and 6.

Shortly after the Itahca meeting, conversations began with Ann Morgan Campbell, Exectuvie Director, and Timothy Walch, Associate Director of the Society of American Archivists, which has offices on the Chicago Circle campus of the University of Illinois. Agreement regarding the desirability of a joint meeting of the members of the two organizations particularly concerned with security was reached readily, and plans then were laid for a program to be held on October 13 and 14. The Chairman met on July 27 with Tim Walch to disucss outlines of the meeting and to prepare a tentative agenda. These matters were refined in the late summer, and a detailed agenda for the program was distributed in late September to the likely participants. In addition to members of th ARL Committee and Sue Frankie, the two sessons were attended by Julie Virgo, ACRL Executive Secretary, Timothy Walch, Mary Lynn McCree, editor of papers of Jane Addams, James O'Neil of the National Archives, Ned Berkeley of the University of Virginia, Alex Ladenson of the Chicago Public library,

and by Robert A. McCown, Manuscripts Librarian at the University of Iowa Libraries, who is active in regional and national organizations of archivists. Under a grant to SAA from NEH, Timothy Walch has in draft a manual for the protection and preservation of manuscripts and archival records, copies of which were distributed to ARL committee members as useful background for the disucssions on October 14. Mrs. Ann Morgan Campbell did not parti ipate in our meeting, because she had been seriously injured a few days before in an automobile accident in Phoenix, but Mary Lynn McCree, editor of the Papers of Jan Addams, and Tim Walch did their best to compensate for Mrs. Campbell's regrettable absence. the Principal topics reviewd at the conference were the SAA security program, chaired by Timothy Walch; security problems created by staff and patrons, chaired by Ned Berkeley of the University of Iowa Libraries; and law and legal problems pertaining to theft of rare books and manuscripts, chaired by Alex Ladenson. Each of the four meaty sessions provoked discussions in which most of the participants had something to say; and a summary of these discussions was introduced by the Chairman of the ARL Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books. The SAA would be pleased to have more ARL institutions utilize its security consultants, the service of whom may obtained simply by payment of expenses, and its widely distributed National Register of Lost or Stolen Archival Materials.

Members of the ARL Committee met with Sue Frankie Thursday evening (October 13) at which time they discussed two principal topics: the possibility of establishing a formal relationship between ARL and SAA and recent developments in the planning for ESTC. Members and officers of SAA at the Chicago meeting volunteered that benefits are likely to be derived from creation of a joint ARL-SAA Committee, which if patterned along the lines of SAA joint committees and with AHA and other organizations would be composed of two members from each organization plus the two executive directors. Presently established SAA joint committees meet twice a year, and a committee composed of ARL and SAA representatives presumably would do likewise. Joint concerns such as security of collections and possible reforms in the tax credits allowed to donors of their own manuscripts could be explored by members of a joint committee who in turn would report to their respective boards. The ARL Committee enthusiastically recommends that the Board of Directors of ARL indicate to SAA that our organization is interested in the creation of the suggested joint committee and would endeavor to work out the details of any such arrangement after SAA expreesses its willingness to cooperate along these lines with ARL.

Some progress on the short-title catalog of 18th Centruy Books in English has been made since the Committee's exploration of this topic at the Spring meeting in Ithaca. the British Library is "encoding" its 18th century English language holdings, a pilot project to assist in planning for the entire undertaking is to be launched soon in the New York Public Library, and a definitive list of early American and Canadian imprints is to be prepared. The "enrichment" by ARL holdings of the main entries currently in preparation probably is at least three years away, but, in the meantime, ARL libraries are encouraged by its Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books to undertake, wherever practical, the creation of a chronological file of eighteenth century publications in English. As reported to the ARL membership in San

Diego, Cornell University seven years ago culled its shelf list of 1400 drawers in about 700 man-hours. The example of the Cornell University Libraries led the University of Iowa Libraries to make a similar effort during the summer of 1977, and an estimated 800,000 cards in the shelf-list were reviewed in 860 hours by personnel engaged largely in regular duties at the Reference Desk. This examination revealed that the 885 eighteenth century publications in English remained on the open shelves. These publications now will join the twenty-seven hundred others shelved in the Special Collections Department, and copies of the culled shelf list cards were made for the chronological file of early publications maintained in that unit. The existence of this expanded file in Iowa City has been reported to Mr. Thomas R. Adams, Librarian of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University, in the event that his board might want to utilize such a compilation in making estimates of the size and nature of the projected ESTC. Several members of the Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books believe that other institutions in ARL have culled their shelf lists for 18th century publications in English, and the Committee wants to encourage libraries to accomplish this wherever it may be done without difficulty.

Members of the Committee appreciate the opportunities for disucssion and action provided through meetings at Ithaca and in Chicago and look forward to a meeting in the Lilly Library at Bloomington, Indiana, tentatively scheduled for April 20-21, 1978.

William Cagle
Herbert Finch
John Finzi
Leslie W. Dunlap,
Chairman

October 18, 1977

APPENDIX - D

# REPORT OF THE ARL PRESERVATION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS COMMITTEE, OCT. 1977

Although this Committee, as a Committee, has not been particularly active during the year, a number of developments of interest to the membership have occured. the focus of national preservation activities is now clearly directed to the Library of Congress where, following a December National Preservation Planning Conference, a National Preservation Office has been established. The chairman of A.R.L.'s Committee attended the December meeting and was subsequently appointed to the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee to the National Preservation Plan. This Committee has held two meetings thus far and is attempting to establish priorities for the national plan. With the Library of Congress assuming an apparent national leadership role in so many areas, including national network development, the national periodicals center, a newly formed Center for the Book, and the national Preservation Plan, there is some concern that preservation is bound to be left in the dust in the competition for funds from public and foundation sources. Nonetheless, the initiative of the Library of Congress in preservation matters must be welcomed by all those concerned with the protection of our nation's library resources.

In the Preservation Committee report of October 1976 we suggested that creation of a nationally accessible on-line data base of microform masters should be a very high priority in the national preservation picture. It is gratifying to report that this priority has become a major concern of the National Preservation Office and has received the strongest possible encouragement from the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. The Committee recommended that the Library of Congress begin capturing currently received data in machine-readable form as soon as possible while deferring the question of retrospective conversion of the cumulated National Register of Microform Masters until a current system is operating smoothly. Eventually we must work toward a system for easy reproduction of these masters to answer the needs of our member libraries.

During the year A.R.L.'s Office of Management Studies distributed a questionnaire on members' activities in preservation and, from the results, produced a SPEC flyer and SPEC kit on preservation as part of its wider efforts in the Collection Analysis Program. Unfortunately, or perhaps symptomatically, the membership response to the preservation section of the questionnaire was less than 50% in contrast to the 70% response to the collection development section. Though this response may provide a good index to the preservation priority in A.R.L. libraries, it is also likely that the resulting products gave a less than comprehensive view of preservation activities among our members.

Several member libraries received significant grants for preservation activities, especially through the new Challenge Grant Program of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Recipients included Case Western Reserve University, Princeton University, and The New York Public Library. Such projects are likely to proliferate and the Committee would be very interested to hear of such efforts, both proposed and funded.

APPENDIX - E

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Foreign Acquisitions Committee on East Asia

Annual Report, 1976/1977

This report will concentrate on updating information provided in the Committee's Annual Report, 1974/1975. (No report was submitted for the year 1975/1976).

In his quinquennial survey of East Asian libraries entitled Current Status of East Asian Collections in American Libraries and sponsored by the Committee on East Asian Libraries of the Association for Asian Studies, T. H. Tsien includes this ominous note:

> The development of [the 93] East Asian collections in [North] American libraries during the period of 1971/75, if compared with that in the previous decade, was in a general state of stagnation and retrenchment.*

Tsien points out that with the exception of a few major collections reporting moderate gains, most libraries have suffered losses in growth and some have become inactive or have been indefinitely suspended. He further notes that while inflation and budgetary cuts have been the major causes of these difficulties, other factors have also contributed to the complexity of the problems. "The greater dependence on original and manual work in technical operations", he states, "fewer useful reference tools, higher unit costs, and less coordination and cooperation among the collections, in comparison with their Western language counterparts, are some of the problems involving economy and efficiency. More recently, attention has been called to rationalization of acquisitions, improvement of accessibility, sharing of resources, and upgrading of personnel, all of which need...careful planning."

*T.H. Tsien, Current Status of East Asian Collections in American Libraries. Washington, D. C. Center for Chinese Research Materials, Association of Research Libraries, 1976. p. 6. Tsien's invaluable survey provides detailed tabulated information in the following areas: 1) Holdings; 2) Growth, 1869-1975; 3) Geographical distribution; 4) Fiscal support; 5) Acquisitions, cataloging, and arrearages; 6) Personnel; 7) Unit capabilities and costs of processing; 8)-10) Current status of Chinese, Japanese and Korean collections; 11) Access and service; and 12) Patrons.

ACLS Steering Committee for a Study of the Problems of East Asian Libraries.

In response to requests for a thoroughgoing analysis of problems affecting development, the Ford Foundation funded an ACLS Steering Committee for a Study of the Problems of East Asian Libraries headed by Professor George M. Beckmann, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Washington, and a specialist in modern Japanese history. The committee, which included representatives of university administrations (the provosts of Yale and Stanford), library directorships (Columbia and Chicago), area specialist scholars (Michigan and Washington), and East Asian libraries (Harvard-Yenching and the Library of Congress), commenced deliberations in 1976. It has produced a Draft Report, which, in final form, will be submitted to the Ford Foundation.

The Report, which calls for the development of a national East Asian library system within the gradually evolving American research library network, will emphasize the importance of supporting and strengthening existing East Asian libraries; the creation of regional consortia and national pools; and the development of a comprehensive bibliographic data base.

Among its recommendations will be the following:

1. With respect to bibliographic controls, that projects be organized to compile a retrospective national union catalog of East Asian imprints, a retrospective union list of serials, and a union list of microforms, as well as the establishment of an NPAC center to control current Chinese and Korean publications.

2. With respect to collection development and access, that some division of labor among major university libraries in the acquisition of research materials be instituted together with a more efficient and equitably supported system of interlibrary loan; that East Asian serials be included in the proposed National Periodicals Center; that East Asian monographs be included in the suggested national current foreign monograph loan collection; and that support be provided for documentation centers focussing on ephemera primarily of a socio-political nature.

3. With respect ot technical and personnel matters, that support be provided for the systematic participation of East Asian librarians in organizations formulating and implementing national cataloging standards; that the Library of Congress include East Asian materials in its national preservation program; and that adequate training programs be instituted for East Asian librarians.

It is expected that the Report when issued, possibly early in 1978, will have a substantial impact on the development of bibliographic controls for East Asian librarianship.

Other activities

The ARL Foreign Acquisitions Committee on East Asia is continuing to monitor special sources of funding for East Asian libraries. Of particular interest is the probable availability of substantial funding from the Japan-United States Friendship Commission for acquisition purposes. Income from a U.S. Government Trust Fund of $30 million in dollars and yen combined is available for, among other purposes, "major collections of Japanese books and publications in appropriate libraries located throughout the United States." (From the Commission's Announcement of Programs, 1977-78). Inquiries to the Commission, in its first year of activity, may be sent to the Executive Director, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Suite 709, Washington, D. C. 20009.

Respectfully submitted,

Warren Tsuneishi, Chairman
Library of Congress

Eugene Wu, Harvard-Yenching Library

Weiying Wan, Asia Library,
University of Michigan

October 7, 1977

APPENDIX - F

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE ON LATIN AMERICAN ACQUISITIONS

Dr. Nettie Lee Benson of the University of Texas Library and Mr. Donald Wisdom of the Library of Congress served as committee members. There was no formal meeting during the year, although members discussed acquisition problems and related matters at the ALA midwinter meeting and again at the annual meeting of the Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials (SALALM) in June. As in past years, this report draws heavily on the activities of SALALM and its various committees, particularly the Committee on Acquisitions and the Committee on Bibliography and their various subcommittees.

1. Several guides have appeared recently and are of interest to acquisition librarians. They are:

   Latin America, Spain, and Portuguese: an annotated bibliography of paperback books. 2d. rev. ed. Compiled by Georgette M. Dorn. Washington, Library of Congress, 1976.

   Whitmore, Marilyn, comp. Latin American publications available by gift and exchange. Part I (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Central America). Part II is expected to be ready for the 1978 SALALM meeting. Copies are available at $4.00 from the SALALM Secretariat.

2. The Latin American Microforms Project (LAMP) is negotiating a major filming project with the Biblioteca Nacional and the Arquivo Nacional in Rio de Janeiro. Material to be filmed in these two repositories includes the most complete collections available of the annual reports of the Brazilian provinces between 1830 and 1889. An index to these reports has already been published by Ann Graham under the title of Subject Guide to Statistics in the Presidential Reports of the Brazilian Provinces 1830-1889. LAMP, now in its second year, has secured permission from the publishers to film Siempre (Mexico) and Ercilla (Chile). Further, LAMP has developed a list of serials titles which will be filmed as funds permit.

3. A price index for Latin American books developed by SALALM and covering the years 1973-1976 appears in the SALALM Working Papers. It also is published in The Bowker Annual. The index will continue to appear annually in the SALALM Newsletter.

4. The Microfilm Projects Newsletter, prepared annually by Suzanne Hodgman of the University of Wisconsin, appears in the Final Reports and Working Papers of the twenty-second SALALM conference. This continues a useful guide to microfilms of significant items about Latin America acquired by research libraries thoughout the country.

5. Hispanic American Periodical Index (HAPI). First published in 1974 at Arizona State University, the index has been greatly expanded since its move to UCLA. The editor, Barbara Cox, with the assistance of contributing editors throughout the country, has secured a grant from NEH to make the expansion possible. The next issue is an essential bibliographic guide to periodical literature. Most of the contributors are members of SALALM.

6. A final publication project in progress is the supplement to Arthur Gropp's Bibliography of Latin American Bibliographies being completed under the editorship of Daniel Cordeiro of Syracuse University. Also a product of a SALALM committee, this bibliography will appear in the winter of 1977.

It appears that there is stronger sentiment and greater need to increase access to scholars to materials which by their very volume have exceeded the ability of any single institution to provide them on a comprehensive basis. Greater cooperation, increased networking arrangements, and the need for recognizing and supporting regional libraries to support the nation's research needs from federal funds were discussed at the Gainesville SALALM meeting. It seems apparent that some or all of these suggested techniques will need to be employed to a much greater extent than has been practiced in the past. It would seem appropriate for ARL to further study this matter, following recommendations made by the Task Force on Library and Information Resources to the Government/Academic Interface Committee of the ACE's International Education Project.

Respectfully submitted for the Committee on Latin American Acquisitions by Carl W. Deal, September 12, 1977.

APPENDIX - G

ATTENDANCE AT 91ST MEMBERSHIP MEETING
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND
OCTOBER 27, 1977

University of Alabama Libraries
James F. Wyatt

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
Robert Adams

Arizona State University Library
Donald Koepp

Boston University Library
Dorothy P. Ladd

Brigham Young University
A. Dean Larsen

University of British Columbia Library
Eleanor Mercer

Brown University Library
Frederick Lynden

University of California Library, Berkeley
Richard M. Dougherty

University of California Library, Davis
Bernard Kreissman

University of California Library, Los Angeles
Norman Dudley

University of California Library, San Diego
Millicent Abell

University of California Library, Santa Barbara
Allen B. Veaner

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
James V. Jones

University of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

University of Cincinnati Libaries
Harold Schell

Colorado State University Library
Le Moyne W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

Cornell University Libraries
J. Gormly Miller

Duke University Libraries
Connie R. Dunlap

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

Emory University Library
Paul Cousins

Florida State University Library
Charles E. Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
Warren N. Boes

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

University of Hawaii Library
Don L. Bosseau

University of Houston Libraries
Robert V. Haynes

Howard University Libraries
Binford H. Conley

University of Illinois Library
Robert W. Oram

Indiana University Libraries
W. Carl Jackson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
David H. Stam

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
James Ranz

Kent State University Libraries
Hyman W. Kritzer

University of Kentucky Libraries
Paul Willis

Library of Congress
William Welsh

Louisiana State University Library
D. W. Schneider

McGill University Library
Marianne Scott

McMaster University
William Ready

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

University of Massachusetts Library
Richard J. Talbot

Mass. Inst. of Technology Libraries
Jay Lucker

University of Miami Library
Archie L. McNeal

University of Michigan Library
Frederick H. Wagman

University of Minnesota Libraries
Eldred Smith

Michigan State University Library
Henery Koch

University of Missouri Library
Robert Cole

National Agricultural Library
Richard A. Farley

National Library of Canada
Joseph Guy Sylvestre

National Library of Medicine
James Barry

New York University Libraries
Carlton C. Rochell

New York Public Library
Richard W. Couper

New York State Library
Peter Paulson

University of Notre Dame Libraries
George Sereiko

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

Ohio State University Libraries
William J. Studer

University of Oklahoma Library
James K. Zink

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
H. William Axford

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Glenora E. Rossell

Princeton University Library
Richard Boss

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Queen's University
Margot B. McBurney

Rice University Library
Richard L. O'Keeffe

University of Rochester Libraries
Margaret Perry

Rutgers University Library
George A. Carroll

State Univ. of New York at Albany
C. James Schmidt

State Univ. of New York at Stony Brook
John B. Smith

Stanford University Libraries
Paul Mosher

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Vija Karklins

University of Southern California
Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinois University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

University of South Carolina
Kenneth E. Toombs

Syracuse University Libraries
Donald C. Anthony

Temple University Library
Arthur T. Hamlin

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Harold W. Billings

Texas A&M University Libraries
Irene B. Hoadley

University of Toronto Libraries
Robert B. Blackburn

University of Utah Libraries
Roger Hanson

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ.
H. Gordon Bechanan

Washington University Libraries
Renata Rotkowicz

University of Washington Library
Merle N. Boylan

Washington State University Library
Allene F. Schnaitter

University of Western Ontario
Robert Lee

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.

Guests

Calvin Boyer - University of Mississippi
Frederick Burkhardt - National Commission on Library and Information Science
Margaret Child - National Endowment for the Humanities
Fred Cole - Council on Library Resources
Abigail Dahl-Hansen - Princeton University Library
Sheila Dowd - University of California Library, Berkeley - Speaker
William S. Dix - Speaker
Hendrik Edelman - Cornell University Libraries
Jean Boyer Hamlin - Rutgers University Library
Graham R. Hill - Council on Library Resources Intern - Indiana
Stephen A. McCarthy Annapolis, Maryland
Ronald P. Naylor - University of Maryland
Shelley Phipps - Council on Library Resources Intern - Duke
Judtta R. Reed - Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
Soete, George J. - Arizona State University
Carl Spaulding - Council on Library Resources
Alphonse Trezza - National Commission on Libraries and Information Science
Julie Virgo - American Council on Research Libraries
Wedgeworth, Robert - American Library Association
Virginia P. Whitney

ARL Staff

John G. Lorenz, Executive Director
Suzanne O. Frankie, Associate Exeuctive Director
James L. Beattie, ARL Research Specialist
Duane Webster. Director Office of University Library Management Studies
Jefferey J. Gardner, Management Research Specialist
Deanna Marcum, Training Program Coordinator
Maxine Sitts, SPEC Coordinator
P. K. Yu, Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials

ATTENDENCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

| | |
|---|---|
| Abell, Millicent | University of California Library, San Diego |
| Adams, Robert | University of Arizona Library |
| Anderson, Le Moyne W. | Colorado State University Library |
| Anthony, Donald C. | Syracuse University Libraries |
| Axford, William H. | University of Oregon Library |
| Barry, James | National Library of Medicine |
| Bechanan, H. Gordon | Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State University |
| Billings, Harold W. | University of Texas Libraries |
| Blackburn, Robert H. | University of Toronto Libraries |
| Boes, Warren N. | University of Georgia Libraries |
| Boss, Richard | Princeton University Library |
| Bosseau, Don L. | University of Hawaii Library |
| Boylan, Merle N. | University of Washington Library |
| Bryant, Douglas W. | Harvard University Library |
| Budington, William S. | John Crerar Library |
| Carroll, George A. | Rutgers University Library |
| Cole, Robert | University of Missouri Library |
| Conley, Binford H. | Howard University Libraries |
| Couper, Richard W. | New York Public Library |
| Cousins, Paul | Emory University Library |
| Dagnese, Joseph M. | Purdue University Library |
| De Gennaro, Richard | University of Pennsylvania Libraries |
| Dougherty, Richard | University of California Library, Berkeley |
| Dudley, Norman | University of California Library, Los Angeles |
| Dunlap, Connie R. | Duke University Libraries |
| Dunlap, Leslie W. | University of Iowa Libraries |
| Farley, Richard A. | National Agricultural Library |
| Forth, Stuart | Pennsylvania State University Library |
| Grisham, Frank P. | Joint University Libraries |
| Haas, Warren J. | Columbia University Libraries |
| Hamlin, Arthur T. | Temple University Library |
| Hanson, Roger | University of Utah Libraries |
| Harrar, H. Joanne | University of Maryland Library |
| Haynes, Robert V. | University of Houston Libraries |
| Hoadley, Irene | Texas A&M University Library |
| Hunt, Donald R. | University of Tennessee Libraries |
| Jackson, W. Carl | Indiana University Libraries |
| Jeffs, Joseph E. | Georgetown University Library |
| Jones, James V. | Case Western Reserve University Libraries |

| | |
|---|---|
| Karklins, Vija | Smithsonian Institute Libraries |
| Kidman, Roy L. | University of Southern California Library |
| Koch, Henry | Michigan State University Library |
| Koepp, Donald | Arizona State University Library |
| Kreissman, Bernard | University of California Library, Davis |
| Kritzer, Hyman W. | Kent State University Libraries |
| | |
| Ladd, Dorothy P. | Boston University Library |
| Larsen, A. Dean | Brigham Young University |
| Lathem, Edward C. | Dartmouth College Libraries |
| Lee, Robert | University of Western Ontario |
| Lucker, Jay | Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries |
| Lynden, Frederick | Brown University Library |
| | |
| McBurney, Margot B. | Queen's University |
| McDonald, John P. | University of Connecticut Library |
| McElderry, Stanley | University of Chicago Library |
| McGowan, John P. | Northwestern University Libraries |
| McNeal, Archie L. | University of Miami Library |
| Mercer, Eleanor | University of British Columbia Library |
| Miller, Charles E. | Florida State University Library |
| Miller, J. Gormly | Cornell University Libraries |
| Mosher, Paul | Stanford University Libraries |
| | |
| O'Keeffe, Richard L. | Rice University Library |
| Oram, Robert W. | Univeristy of Illinois Library |
| | |
| Paulson, Peter | New York State Library |
| Peel, Bruce | University of Alberta Library |
| Perry, Margaret | University of Rochester Libraries |
| Peterson, Kenneth G. | Southern Illinois University Library |
| | |
| Ranz, James | University of Kansas Library |
| Ready, William | McMaster University |
| Rochell, Carlton C. | New York University Libraries |
| Rogers, Rutherford D. | Yale University Libraries |
| Rossell, Glenora E. | University of Pittsburgh Libraries |
| Rotkowicz, Renata | Washington University Libraries |
| Rouse, Roscoe | Oklahoma State University Library |
| | |
| Schell, Harold | University of Cincinnati Libraries |
| Schmidt, C. James | State University of New York at Albany |
| Schnaitter, Allene F. | Washington State University Library |
| Schneider, D.W. | Louisiana State University Library |
| Scott, Marianne | McGill University Library |
| Sereiko, George | University of Notre Dame Libraries |
| Smith, Eldred | University of Minnesota Libraries |
| Smith, John B. | State University of New York at Stony Brook |
| Stam, David H. | Johns Hopkins University Library |
| Studer, William J. | Ohio State University Libraries |
| Sylvestre, Joseph Guy | National Library of Canada |

| | |
|---|---|
| Talbot, Richard J. | University of Massachusetts Libraries |
| Toombs, Kenneth E. | University of South Carolina |
| Treyz, Jr., Joseph H. | University of Wisconsin Libraries |
| Veaner, Allen B. | Universty of California Library, Santa Barbara |
| Wagman, Frederick H. | University of Michigan Library |
| Welsh, William | Library of Congress |
| Williams, Gordon R. | Center for Research Libraries |
| Willis, Paul | University of Kentucky Libraries |
| Wyatt, James F. | University of Alabama Libraries |
| Zink, James K. | University of Oklahoma Library |

APPENDIX - H

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

January, 1978

## ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1977/1978

Ray Frantz, Jr., President
Le Moyne Anderson, Vice President & President-Elect
Edward C. Lathem, Past President
Richard Dougherty (Oct. 1980)
Connie R. Dunlap (Oct. 1979)
Richard A. Farley (Oct. 1978)
Frank Grisham (Oct. 1980)
Jay Lucker (Oct. 1980)
Rutherford D. Rogers (Oct. 1979)
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr. (Oct. 1978)

## ARL STANDING COMMITTEES

### Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

William Cagle, Lilly Library (1979)
C. Herbert Finch, Cornell (1979)
John Finzi, LC (1979)
Leslie Dunlap, Chairman (1979)

### Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm

Gustave Harrer (1978)
Bruce Peel (1978)
Gordon Williams (1978)
Joseph Jeffs, Chairman (1978)

### Committee on Interlibrary Loan

H. Gordon Bechanan (1978)
Richard Boss (1978)
Richard E. Chapin (1978)
Thomas Gillies (1979)
Ron Naylor, University of Maryland (1979)
David Weber (1978)
Jay Lucker, Chairman (1978)

Committee on a National Periodicals System

Richard Boss (1980)
Richard De Gennaro (1980)
John McDonald (1980)
Allen Veaner (1980)
James Schmidt, Chairman (1980)

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee

Philip McNiff (1979)
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University, (1979)
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr. (1979)
Frederick Wagman, Chairman (1978)

Committee on Nominations

Le Moyne Anderson, Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials

James F. Govan (1979)
Joanne Harrar (1979)
David Stam, Chairman (1979)

ARL/ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards

Calvin Boyer, University of Mississippi
Beverly Lynch, University of Illinois Chicago Circle Campus
John P. McDonald
Stanley McElderry
Richard Talbot
David Watkins, Brandeis University
Eldred Smith, Chairman

## ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

### Africa

Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution of War, Peace and Revolution
J.M.C. Crossey, Yale University
Esther J. Walls, SUNY Stony Brook
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University. Chairman

### Middle East

George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, University of Indiana
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

### Eastern Europe

Joseph A Placek, University of Michigan
Laurence Miller, University of Illinois
Paul Horecky, Library of Congress, Chairman

### East Asia

Weying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

### South Asia

Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

### Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, University of Michigan

### Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom. Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

### Western Europe

Norman Dudley, University of California at Los Angeles
Ten-Tsai Feng, Boston Public Library
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University, Chairman

## ARL TASK FORCES

### Task Force on ARL Membership (1978)

Don Bosseau
John McDonald
Stanley McElderry
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Frederick Wagman, Chairman

### Task Force on Bibliographic Control (1980)

Joseph H. Howard, Library of Congress
James Govan
Joseph Dagnese
Ake I. Koel, Yale University
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Chairman

### Task Force on ARL Statistics (1979)

Donald Koepp
Kendon Stubbs, University of Virginia
Richard Talbot, Chairman

### Task Force on National Library Network Development (1978)

Hugh Atkinson
Richard De Gennaro
John Gribbin
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
William Welsh
Richard Dougherty, Chairman

## REPRESENTATIVES

| | |
|---|---|
| ANSI Committee Z-39 | John Lorenz |
| CONSER Project | Ryburn Ross, Cornell |
| Joint Committee on Union List of Serials | William Budington |
| Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee (ALA) | Donald Koepp |
| United States Book Exchange | Joanne Harrar |
| Special Libraries Association | Joseph M. Dagnese |

CENTER FOR CHINESE RESEARCH MATERIALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Roy Hofheinz, Jr., Harvard University
Ying-mao Kau, Brown University
David T. Roy, University of Chicago
Weiying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Philip McNiff, Chairman

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Page Ackerman, UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Frank P. Grisham
Louis Martin, Harvard University
William Studer

APPENDIX - I

MEMBERSHIP LIST
NOVEMBER 1977

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
James F. Wyatt, Dean of Libraries
(202) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Bruce Peel, Director
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 884-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Koepp, Librarian
(602) 965-3415

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Masachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Donald K. Nelson, Director
(801) 374-1211 Ext. 2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Richard Dougherty, Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library
Davis California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Russell Shank, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Millicent Abell, Librarian
(714) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Allen B. Veaner, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Stanley McElderry, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Harold Schell, Dean, Library Admin. &
Director of Libraries (513) 475-2533

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80309
Clyde Walton, Director
(303) 492-6144

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Erle P. Kemp, Acting Univ. Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
J. Gormly Miller, Director
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian
(603) 646-2236

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Connie R. Dunlap, Librarian
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Paul Cousins, Acting Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
Warren N. Boes, Director
(404) 542-2716

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Don L. Bosseau, Director
(808) 958-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robert V. Haynes, Interim Dir. of Libs.
(713) 749-2340

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C. 20001
Binford H. Conley, Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh Atkinson, Director
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
W. Carl Jackson, Dean of Libraries
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Lib. Admin.
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren Kuhn, Dean of Library Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
The MIlton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
David Stam, Librarian
(301) 338-8325

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost &
Director of Libraries (216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 426-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry, Jr., Director
(504) 388-3969

McGill University Library
Montreal, P.Q., Canada H3C 3G1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L85 4L6
William Ready, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4781

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Miami Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Archie L. McNeal, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Frederick H. Wagman, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard Chapin, Librarian
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Eldred Smith, Director
(617) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
John Gribbin, Director
(314) 882-2739

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farley, Director
(301) 344-3779

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A ON4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 992-0401

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

New York Public Library
New York, New York 10018
Richard W. Couper, President
(212) 695-3231

New York State Library
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224
Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian
(518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-2140

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
David E. Sparks, Director
(219) 283-7317

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
William Studer, Director
(614) 422-6152

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
James B. Alsip, Interim Dir. of Libs.
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
H. William Axford, University Librn.
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Richard Boss, Librarian
(609) 452-3170

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 749-2571

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Margot B. McBurney, Chief Libn.
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main, Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Richard L. O'Keeffe, Librarian
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Alan R Taylor, Acting Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Geroge A. Carroll, Acting Univ. Libn.
(201) 932-7505

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at Tenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Jean Smith, Acting Director
(202) 381-5496

University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libs.
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 746-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of
Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
C. James Schmidt, Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Saktidas Roy, Director
(716) 831-4216

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11790
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Lib.
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Harold W. Billings, Act. Dir.
(512) 471-3811

Texas A&M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Robert Blackburn, Director
(416) 978-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
Dorothy G. L. Whittemore, Acting Libn.
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ.
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director of Libs.
(703) 951-5593

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Dr. Allene F. Schnaitter, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Ms. Renata Rotkowicz, Act. Univ. Libn.
(314) 863-0100 Ext. 4523

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario
London 72, Canada
Dr. Robert Lee, Director of Libs.
(519) 679-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456